

A N  
A N S W E R  
T O A  
T R E A T I S E  
O U T O F  
Ecclesiastical History,

Translated from  
An Ancient Greek M A N U S C R I P T in  
the Publick Library at Oxford,

B Y  
HUMFRET HODY, B.D. &c.

And Published under the Title of  
*The Unreasonableness of a Separation from the Non-Resistant*  
T O S H E W,

*That although a Bishop was unjustly deprived, neither he nor the  
Church ever made a Separation, if the Successor was not an Heretick.*

To which is added,  
The CANONS in the Baroccian Manuscript  
Omitted by Mr. H O D Y.

---

L O N D O N :

Printed, and are to be sold by J. Wells, near S. Paul's Church-Yard, 1691.

Reverendissimo in Christo Patri  
ac Domino Domino Wilhelmo  
Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi Totius Anglie  
Primali et Metropolitano,

Viro, soli, Maximo:  
Omni virtutis & pietatis exemplo:

Constanti, felici,  
utrinque fortuna Victori

Fidelitatis erga Deum pariter ac Regē  
vindicte. Ecclesie Anglicane Patroni.

Hoc, quicquid est studij atq; operæ D. D. L.

---

---

T H E

P R E F A C E.

**T***hat a Separation is always unreasonable on one side or the other, is without all question ; but that it is unreasonable to separate from New Bishops that are placed in the Sees of Bishops, who are uncanonically deposed, for this Cause only, that they are in Possession, upon what Reason and Justice soever, of the said Episcopal Sees, is very strange Doctrine, and such as was never, I think, heard of in the Church of England, till this Treatise was published. For in the Sense of the Catholick Church in her Canons and Constitutions, the New Bishop himself in such a Case makes the Separation, and to continue Communion with the true Bishop is not to separate from the wrongful Possessor ; but to keep our former Place and Station, to adhere to the Right, and not to follow those, who have set themselves up in opposition to it.*

*But the Doctrine, which this Anonymous Greek Author is brought to vouch for to the World, is of such a pernicious Nature, and, if it be allowed, must have such destructive Consequences in the Church, that I cannot but think, that all Men, who have a sincere Love for the Church of England, whatever their Opinions may be in other Matters, will not be ill pleased to see it proved, that there is no Example to be found of this in the Practice of the Greek Church, till it was reduced to so low and deplorable a Condition,*

## P R E F A C E.

*dition, as to be no longer a Pattern for Imitation, but a Caution rather for us to beware of those things which brought the Greeks into that Distress, under which they have so long groaned.*

*And if we will but give our selves the least leisure to consider; what is then that can bring more certain and speedy Ruine upon a Church, than to act by such a Principle; as makes all Ecclesiastical Authority have its sole and entire dependance upon external Force and Power, and upon the casual Success and Events of things?*

*For if, when the Civil Magistrate shall displace a Bishop for any frivolous cause, or for no Cause at all, but with the greatest and most apparent Injustice, all Christians shall be obliged in Conscience to submit to the Intruder, if he be but Orthodox, and not to adhere to their lawful Bishop; this utterly destroys all Church Authority, and gives it up wholly into the Power of the Magistrate, who may set up what Bishop he pleases, provided they be no Hereticks, and change them as often as he pleases, and the Clergy and People shall be bound in Conscience to take no further notice of the dispossessed, but to live under the new ones, be they never so many, and never so bad, in all Acts of Communion and Obedience. Now unless the Church can be ruined by nothing but Heresie, or there be nothing that can render a Bishop unqualified for his Station but Heresie, it is evident that this Doctrine leaves it at the Mercy of the Prince, whether there shall long be any Church in his Dominions.*

*It is manifest, that these Principles make all Church Censures ineffectual, and expose the Church to all the Mischiefs of Erastianism: For if a Prince should prefer an excommunicated Person to the See of the Bishop, by whom he stands excommunicated; supposing only that he was not excommunicated for Heresie; this Person, tho never so justly excommunicated, must be owned and obeyed instead of the Bishop who excommunicated him; which lodges all Church Power*



## P R E F A C E,

*in the Prince, and makes all Ecclesiastical Censures of no effect for the Benefit and Preservation of the Church, whenever he pleases.*

*A Schismatical Prince, by this Doctrine, may set up Schismatical Bishops, and the Church will have no Remedy against them. For instance, if Constantine had been a Novatian or Donatist, he might have deposed the Rightful Bishops, and have set up Novatians or Donatists in their stead; if those Sects were then only Schisms; and they were no more at first: But whoever can imagin, that the Clergy and People of that Age would have communicated with them, and have deserted their true Bishop, may indeed believe all that our Author has said. Tho the truth is, according to his Principles, no Prince can be a Schismatick, because he may make what Bishops he pleases, and so can make what Church he pleases, and it will be the Duty of Christians to communicate, not with their Bishops, but with their Prince, or, which is the same thing, with what Bishops he appoints.*

*A Popish Prince might set up Popish Bishops amongst us; for he could never want Men, who at least upon as good Grounds and from as good Authorities, as those upon which this Doctrine is propounded to us, would prove that Popery is no Herefie.*

*A Prince of a Latitudinarian Faith may by these Principles give us Socinian Bishops: For the Disciples of Episcopius and Curcellæus will undertake to prove that the Points in Controversie are not of necessity to Salvation, and do not consequently involve the Assertors of them in Herefie.*

*And if a Prince should design never so well, for the Glory of God, and the Interest of Religion; yet how easie it is for Princes to be mistaken and misled in things of this nature, we may see in Constantine himself, who was deceived by the Arians into a good Opinion of them, after the Council of Nice, even to the sending St. Athanasius away from his See; tho he took care to keep it void from him till his return,*

## P R E F A C E.

*turn, to prevent a Schism, which by the Practice of the Church, could not otherwise have been avoided. But this is most of all remarkable in the unhappy Reign of Constantius, who certainly was a very Devout Prince, and had very good intentions in calling so many Synods, and therefore the Fathers often mention him, with Respect and with great Compassion; but was miserably deluded and imposed upon by the Arians, and persuaded to banish all the Orthodox Bishops, and fill up the Sees with those of their own number. But we must observe, that tho Constantius believed, that the Arians were not Hereticks but Orthodox, and died in his error, as S. Athanasius declares, tho S. Gregory Nanzanzen and Theodoret, say the contrary: and therefore cannot be supposed to want any inclinations to Depose Athanasius by his own Power, and the Arians wanted no Malice against Athanasius, nor no Authority with the Emperour to put him upon it, yet because, according to the Doctrine professed on both sides, this could not be done, they were forced to be at all that trouble to get a Synod of their own Party to effect it. But if it be left to the Arbitrary Will of the Prince to Depose the Orthodox Bishops at his Pleasure, and supply the vacancies with any whom he thinks fit, and their Dioceses must be obliged in Conscience to acknowledge them, he will be sure in a short time to have such Bishops as shall determine that only to be Heresie, which he will have to be so; and it is a vain thing to say, that Heretical Bishops must not be promoted, or that they must not be obeyed, for in a little time by this Doctrine there will be nothing reputed Heresie, nor Schism, but to hold a different Opinion, and a different Communion from that of the Prince.*

*But to come nearer home, this Doctrine denies the Church a Power, which is granted to be in all other Societies; own no Head but of their own choosing, or who is, otherwise, regularly set over them according to their Charter or Constitution; and it seems, if King James had put in new Bishops*

## P R E F A C E.

*shops against the consent of the Chapters, the Dioceses would have been obliged to obey them, though the Fellows of Magdalen College in Oxford were bound in Conscience not to acknowledge a President, who was forced upon them against their Statutes.*

*It may perhaps be said that we are secured from all the inconveniences that would follow from this Doctrine, inas-much as by the Laws of the Land no Bishop can be forced upon us by the King; but he must be chosen by the Chapter of the Cathedral Church of the Diocese, to which he is nominated. But first, if this Doctrine be calculated only for our own Church, and we must be governed by a different Rule from the rest of the Catholick Church, why then is the Practice of the Greek Church brought to recommend it to us. But if this have been the Doctrine and Practice of all Churches, we are not to imagine, that the Laws of the Land can make it no sin, but a Duty to separate from intruding Bishops, when the Laws of God and of his Church enjoyn the contrary. For the Laws of our Country must cease to oblige us in Conscience when they are inconsistent with the Doctrine and Practice of the Church in all Ages; and if these have been always the Principles, and this the Practice of the Church, as it is now pretended, to own the present Bishop, whosoever he be, if he be no Heretick; I doubt it will be in vain to alledge the Laws of the Land against an Intruder, when he is once in Possession, as long as he can keep his Possession; but we must have Bishops de Facto, and must be bound in Conscience to submit to them, by whatever ill means they came in at first. But suppose that the Laws of the Land would be a security to us, (as they have hitherto been, and will be still, if we retain our old Principles) yet how can we be sure that the Laity will be more tender of the Honour and welfare of the Church than the Clergy themselves are? And that, if the Clergy give up the Ecclesiastical Authority, they will not be willing to consent to it; and be contented that a Prince should be absolute in Ec-clesiastical*



## P R E F A C E.

*ecclesiastical Affairs, if he will but act according to Law, in Civil?*

But whatever security there may be from the Secular Power to the Church, since it is incorporated into the State; yet by these Principles the Church could not have supported it self against the Attempts of Schismatics before the Emperours became Christians; and if the Civil Government should withdraw its Protection, it is plain this Scheme leaves the Church no Power to defend it self against the Usurpation of one Bishop upon another: for by this Model of Church-Government, if a Bishop get into Possession of anothers Diocese by any way whatsoever, whether by the Secular Power, or by any other means, provided he be no Heretick; he is from thence forth to be looked upon as the true Bishop, notwithstanding any Canon of the Church against his Usurpation. So that this Notion does effectually dissolve all Church-Government, and leaves no Power and Authority in the Church to preserve it self, but leaves it at the Mercy not only of the Civil Magistrate, but of any Invader, who is no Heretick or does not appear to be such. Novatian, if he could have got into Possession of the Episcopal Throne, must by these Principles have been submitted to as Bishop of Rome, than which nothing can be more absurd, or more contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of the Church in all Ages. And if the Cause of the New Bishops can be defended by none, but such Principles, it is plain, that it is not to be defended at all: for we must not contradict the Doctrine of the Church in all Ages, to serve a present Turn; nor maintain the Church in this Age so as to have no Church left for the next.

But I shall not here undertake further to shew how dangerous and destructive these Principles are to the Church of England, and to Religion in general, much less is it my business to state the Case now in Controversie. I intend only to pursue the Author of this Treatise through his Discoveries,  
which



## P R E F A C E.

which he pretends to make in Ecclesiastical History : and if I can shew that this Greek has put a fallacy upon us, I hope we shall not suffer our selves to be cheated by the impertinent and false Stories of an obscure Writer of no Name nor Authority, but who appears to have lived in the most decayed and worst State of the Greek Church, when their Sermons were nothing but ill digested Rapsodies, which, both for their Style and Sense, will scarce endure the Reading ; their Ecclesiastical Histories nothing but Legends of Miracles, and all their Histories, both Ecclesiastical and Civil, full of such idle Stories as most Men are ashamed to tell after them ; and when by their Vices and Ignorance they had rendered themselves ripe for that Destruction, which soon after came upon them. It is to those Ages that we owe the loss of so many of the Works of the Fathers of the First Centuries, and the Corruption of others, to Countenance the Tenets and Practices of their own times ; and it is no wonder, that when their Bishops were so often Deposed at the pleasure of the Emperour upon frivolous or rather upon very unjust pretences, some should endeavour to make it believed, that such Proceedings must be acquiesced in, according to the Practice of former Ages in the like cases ; when the decay of all sound Knowledge and true Religion, and of all good Orders and Discipline both in Church and State was so great, and their Divisions so incurable, which were principally occasioned, or extremely heightened by the frequent changes of the Patriarchs, that they at last brought utter ruin upon the Empire, and subjected the Church to the Arbitrary Pleasure of the Grand Seignior.

And it is worth our observation, that notwithstanding it had been so customary for the Emperors in the Greek Church to Depose their Bishops, yet after the Thirteenth Century, (and how long after we cannot tell) it was matter of dispute in that Church, whether they ought to Communicate with the new Bishops ; so that this Author's whole Book is a contradi-

## P R E F A C E.

*From to his very design in writing it: for if they had constantly for so many Ages submitted to the Intruding Bishops as often as they were put up, how came there at that time to be any doubt about it? Or how could it then be necessary to prove, with so much Pains and Formality, that which he would make us believe had been the constant Practice of their Church in every Age? If what he says had been true, it could have needed no Proof to them, and since he was forced to be at so much Pains to prove it to the Greeks themselves, that this had ever been the Practice of their own Church, it is a good Argument to us that it was not the Practice of it; for if it had been all along practised, no Man almost among them could have been ignorant of it, since, according to his own account, there was scarce any Age but afforded too many Instances of the Removal of Bishops.*

*Considering all this, I wonder that the learned Writer of the Preface should tell us, that this Author is so unexceptionable a Judge to appeal to: for I should be very sorry, if any exception should lye against the Authors of our own time, that does not lye against this. Yes says he, Surely no uncharitable Aspersions of time-serving, courting Preferment, or the like, that might be cast upon any that should write now in this Cause, can take place against this Author, so remote from the present Age and Controversie. I hope uncharitable Aspersions will take place neither against this Author nor any other, but it is too much to persuade us that Clergy men were never swayed by Interest till now of late; this would be too great a Satyr upon the present Age, and would betray too great ignorance of all that are past; for there is nothing more notorious than that mankind have had the same Passions and Frailties in all Times; and if we were to search for Examples of Prejudice, and Deceit, and Persidiousness, and all manner of ill Practices, we should no where sooner find them, than in those degenerate Ages of the Church. And he tells us, that our Author probably was one of the Bishops that*

## P R E F A C E.

that assisted at the new Patriarchs Consecration, for whose sake all this was written : so that the Case was the same, and the Controversie the same, and the difference is only in Time, and Place, and perhaps in some other as inconsiderable Circumstances.

But I shall apply my self to the Greek Author, and in Answer to him shall consider all that is said in the Preface to strengthen and support his Authorities from Antiquity.

---

AN

---

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE  
**HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY**

---

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION



A N  
**A N S W E R**  
 T O A  
**T R E A T I S E**  
 O U T O F  
**Ecclesiastical History , &c.**

**I** Shall follow our Author in his own way, tho he does not always proceed according to order of Time ; which is no Argument of his Skill or Exactness, but shews that he took up his Materials as he found them, and placed them without any great Care or Method. And to shew his Judgment, we shall see he has sometimes brought Instances which are nothing to his purpose.

He begins with *S. Chrysostom*, and in the first place would insinuate that he was Un canonically Ordained, having received the Order of Deacon by the hands of *Meletius*, who was placed by the *Arians* in the Sea of *Eustathius* Bishop of *Sebastia* in *Armenia*, and was afterwards Translated to *Antioch*, whilst *Eustathius* was yet living : and he observes, that *Meletius*, notwithstanding, was removed to *Antioch* by

the joyn't consent of both the Orthodox and *Arian* Bishops, and that both *S. Basil* and *S. Chrysostom* were Ordained Deacons by him.

By all this we are given to understand, that *Eustathius* of *Sebastia* had great wrong done him, and that *Meletius* being besides made Bishop by the *Arians* could never become a lawful Bishop.

As to the first point : *Eustathius* was condemned in two Synods for his ill Tenets and Practices. He was first Deposed by his own Father *Eulalius* Bishop of *Cesarea* in *Cappadocia*, and was afterwards condemned in a Synod at *Gangre* in *Paphlagonia*, because after he was Deposed, he had done many things contrary to the Canon. He had forbidden to Marry, and commanded to abstain from Meats ; he had caused several Men and their

B

Wives

Wives to depart from each other; those who would not come to Church, he had persuaded to Communicate in their Houses. He made several Servants leave their Masters upon pretences of Piety. He wore the Habit of a Philosopher (which was the misdemeanor his Father at first Deposed him for) and had introduced a new kind of distinct Habit for all of his own Sect. He caused Women to be Shorn. He declared against the set Fasts of the Church, and appointed his Followers to Fast on Sundays. He would not so much as admit any Prayers to be made in the Houses of married Persons, and commanded all to avoid, as a thing abominable, the Benediction and Communion of a Priest, who had a Wife, tho he had married her before he entred into Orders, and he both did and taught many other things of like nature.

*Sozom. l. 4. c. 24.* *Sozomen* relates, that besides his being Deposed at *Caesarea* in *Cappadocia*, and at *Gangre*, he was Excommunicated by a Synod at *Neocesaria* in *Pontus*, and Deposed by *Eusebius* Bishop of *Constantinople*, for his Treachery in some business that he had been entrusted with, and was Convicted of Perjury in a Synod of *Antioch*. To all this I need not add, that he was an *Arian*, and renounced the *Nicene* Creed, which he had once professed, and that *S. Basil* often complains of his false and perverse dealing, and besides

*Basil. Ep. 72. 73. 74. 78. 79. 196.* says, that it was reported of him, that he had reordained some of his Profelites, tho he could scarce believe it, since no Heretick was ever known to dare to do it. These certainly are Crimes which would justify his being Deposed, and it could be no fault in *Meletius* to preside in the See of a Bishop, who for so just Reasons was condemned in several Synods, and had had *Anathema* pronounced against his Doctrines.

The Second thing, viz. That *Meletius* was Consecrated by the *Arians*, was indeed a great objection against him, and had like to have been of very ill Consequence to the Church of *Antioch*. For tho *Meletius* had shewn himself a zealous and learned Assertor of that Orthodox Faith, and was highly esteemed by the Orthodox Bishops, who were mightily satisfied with his Promotion to the See of *Antioch*: yet there was a Party of Men who still retained a Prejudice against him upon the account of his Consecration; and during his Banishment under *Constantius*, *Lucifer Calaritanus* coming to *Antioch* Consecrated *Paulinus* Bishop of that City, which, when he saw the Orthodox Bishops, and particularly *Eusebius* of *Vercelles*, disapprove of it, gave the first occasion to *Lucifer* to begin that Sect, which from him took its denomination. *Meletius* at his return from Exile, under *Julian*, finds the Church of *Antioch* divided into c. 9. three Parties; one, that followed *Eusebius*, *Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.* *Paulinus* the *Arian* Bishop; another that Communicated with *Paulinus*; and a third, that adhered still to himself, as their lawful Bishop: the *Arians* had possessed themselves of all the Churches within the City, but one of the small Churches, which they allowed *Paulinus*, so that he was forced to hold his Assemblies without the Gates. *Meletius* suffered a second Banishment under *Valens*; and when he was restored by *Gratian*, *Paulinus* being then *Antioch. l. 5. c. 5.* *Socr. l. 5. c. 5.* *Meletius's* c. 5. those who were of *Meletius's* c. 5. Communion, endeavoured to have the difference so Composed, that both he and *Paulinus* might together Preside in that Sec. But *Paulinus* refused to agree to it, alledging that *Meletius* had received his Ordination from *Arian* Bishops. Upon this the People were in a Ferment, and caused *Meletius* to resume the Throne in one of the Churches without the City. This bred great contentions

*Theo. c. 3.*

*Secr. l. 3.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*

*Secr. l. c. 23.*

tentions between the Parties, but at last they came to this agreement; That whosoever of these two Bishops should die first, the survivor should be the sole Bishop of the See; and there being six Men then in *Antioch*, who upon the Death of them, might probably make pretensions to the Succession, they were all sworn to this Agreement. And thus the difference was composed, only the *Luciferians* would by no means be prevailed with to Communicate with him, but set up separate Congregations. Thus it was according to the account *Socrates* gives of this Matter; but as *Theodorite* relates it, *Sapores*, whom the Emperor had sent to inspect and regulate this Business, seeing the great equity and condescension of *Meletius*, put him into Possession of the Bishoprick: for he makes no mention of any Agreement between him and *Paulinus*, but only says, that *Meletius* had the See delivered up to him, and *Paulinus* remained Bishop only of that Party, which adhered to him.

*Theod. l. 5.*  
c. 3.

This being the case, since *Meletius* was so eminent a defender of the Orthodox Faith, as he is confessed by all to have been, and had twice suffered Banishment for it, and during his first Banishment had one irregularly placed in his See, and did afterwards, notwithstanding so great a Provocation, use all the Condescension that could be expected in such a Case; it could be no just Prejudice against him, that he was at first made Bishop by the *Arians*, or rather by the *Semi-Arians*, or *Acacians*, who upon occasion would subscribe the *Nicene Creed*, and pretended to have no exceptions to the Doctrines contained in it, but were for taking away the word *ὁμοούσιος*, as if the difference had been only in Terms, contriving in the mean time all the ways possible to undermine the Faith by their own Ex-

*Socr. l. 3.*  
c. 25.

positions. But it does not appear that *Meletius* ever was an *Arian* himself; on the contrary the Orthodox Fathers never mention him, but with the greatest commendations; and he seems to have been imposed upon by the *Acacians* and *Semi-Arians* for a while, who disguised and dissembled their Opinions. For when he was called to give an account of his Faith in the presence of *Constantius* himself, in the Synod at *Antioch*, he declared himself to the entire satisfaction of the Orthodox Bishops; and it was no more than they expected from him, and were before well assured of, which made them so desirous to have him advanced to the See of *Antioch*. And tho *Socrates* says, that *Meletius* subscribed the Form of Faith which *Acacius* produced in the Synod of *Seleucia*; yet this seems to be a mistake, which perhaps the partiality, which he plainly enough discovers for *Paulinus*, might betray him to; for *Meletius's* name is not to be found among the Subscriptions to the Creed of *Acacius* set down in *Epiphanius*.

*Theod. l. 2.*  
c. 31.

*Socr. l. 2.*  
c. 44.

*Epiphanius.*  
Her. 73.

Now it was determined in this Case, in a Council at *Alexandria* (a) that the worst of Hereticks, the very Principal and Leading Men among them upon the renouncing their Errors, and reconciling themselves to the Church by Repentance, should be received to Communion, tho not to Officiate as

(a) "Ὡς τοῖς ἰδὼν χρεωπληρώσει καὶ ὁρίσασθαι, ὁ ἀσκήσιος συγχωρεῖται μὴ μετανοῶσι, μὴ δίδουσι δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐν τόπον κλήρου τοῖς δὲ μὴ αὐθιγῶσι ἰδὼν ὁ ἀσκήσιος, ἡποσυρεῖται δὲ δι' ἀνάγκην καὶ βίαν, ἐκδῆσι δὲ ἰδὼν, μὴ συστασάμεν, ἔχον δὲ καὶ ἰόπον τῷ κλήρῳ, μάλιστα δὲ ὅτι ἀπολογία πᾶσι τῷ ἐκείνῳ. Athanas. Epist. ad Ruhnianum inter ejus op. Tom. 2. p. 40. & apud Conc. Nicen. 2. Act. 1. Col. 75.

B 2

Clergy-



Clergymen; but the less culpable, who had been abused and misled, were likewise to be permitted the Exercise and Administration of their Function. Which is no more than was practised in the Council of Nice it self towards the *Arian* Bishops, who renounced their Heresie, and signed the *Nicene Creed*, as *S. Hierom* urges in his Dialogue *Adversus Luciferianos*, where he disputes this point at large. This was all along the Practice of the Church towards the *Arians* and *Novations*, and *Donatists*, and the *Meletians*, who were so denominated from *Meletius* the *African* Bishop, to admit of their Orders, upon their Reconciling themselves to the Church, and thus it was confirmed and established in the Council of *Nice*. And to the determinations of this Council of *Alexandria*, *Lucifer Calaritanus* himself had given his assent by his Deacon, whom he had sent thither for that purpose, and (b) all the Western Church approved of this Decree as the only Remedy against the *Arian* Heresie. For the true Reason why the Western Bishops espoused the Cause of *Paulinus* against *Meletius* was not for any Objection they had against his Ordination (which was made an Objection by none but the *Luciferians*) but because he had been represented in the West as an Heretick, as *S. Basil* complains, and as it appears from *S. Hierom's* two Epistles to *Damasus*, wherein he desires to know of him, with whom he should Communicate at *Antioch*: and *Paulinus* was thought little better of in the East, for receiving to Communion the Associates of *Marcellus*. But *Meletius* was received as Patriarch of *Antioch*.

*Conc. Nic. Can. 8.*  
*Socr. l. 1. c. 9.*  
*Vales. de Schism. Donatist.*  
*Socr. l. 3. c. 9.*  
*Sozom. l. 5. c. 13.*  
*Basil. Ep. 321. 349.*  
*Id. Epist. 74.*  
*Epiphan. Har. 77.*

(b) *Assensus est huic sententiae Occidens, & per tam necessarium concilium Satanae faucibus mundus oreptus est. Hieron. adv. Luciferian.*

*Antioch* in the General Council of *Constantinople*, and dying there, *S. Gregory Nyssen* in the presence of that Venerable Assembly celebrated his memory with the highest Praises in his Funeral Oration. And upon his death *Flavianus* was by unanimous consent chosen Bishop of *Antioch*, and the choice confirmed in that General Council, *apud* tho *Paulinus* was yet living, who thereupon nominated *Euagrius* for his Successor, but he dying soon after *Paulinus*, no other Bishop was chosen in his room.

*Epist. Synod. C. P. Theod. l. 5. c. 9. Socr. l. 5. c. 15.*

But the state of this Controversie, as it lay between the *Meletians* and *Luciferians*, is a direct confutation of the whole design of this Authors Treatise. For if all Christians are obliged to look no further than to the Bishop in Possession; *Paulinus* was put into possession of the See of *Antioch*, whilst *Meletius* was in Banishment, and he at his return was forced to hold his Assemblies without the City; yet the *Meletians* never thought this any Reason for their compliance; nor did the Adherents of *Paulinus* ever urge it upon them: they urged that *Meletius* had been made Bishop by *Arians*, and that Plea was over-ruled by the determination of a Council held at *Alexandria*; whereas if our Authors notion had then been good Doctrine, it must soon have decided the Question: for no Man could deny but *Paulinus* was actual Bishop in the absence of *Meletius*, which was a better pretence than if he had been turned-out to make way for him; and so it is impossible, but this Argument must have been insisted upon, if this had been then an approved Doctrine; and it had been at least a good Argument in the Eastern Church, where our Author would make us believe, it was always the Custom to Communicate with the Bishop for the time being, however he came to be so: and it is incredible, that in

*Socr. c. 3.*

*Page 2.*



Sacr. l. 6.  
c. 3.

so weighty a Controversie, which was so long depending, no Man should once think of the thing, which could alone decide it, when it was so obvious to all capacities, and is supposed to have been received into the constant Practice of the Church in all such cases. St. *Chrysostom* himself after the death of *Meletius*, for three whole years would not Communicate with either side, and at last, as all, but *Socrates*, testify, was ordained Presbyter by *Flavianus*, that is, he espoused the cause of the *Meletians*, and took directly the contrary side to that, which he ought to have taken by these Principles. For it was a received Maxim, that regularly there could be but one Bishop of one Church at the same time (for if a Bishop appointed his own Successor, and took him in his life time for an Assistant to him, this was an extraordinary case, and he retained the Authority still to himself, or it was at his own choice, whether he would part with any of it) and if the Bishop in Possession were to be the one Bishop, *Meletius* had been precluded by *Paulinus*, when he returned from Banishment, and *Paulinus* was afterwards left in Possession upon the death of *Meletius*. 'Tis plain then that this Doctrine was unknown to the whole Church at that time, and particularly to S. *Chrysostom*, upon whose account this is brought, and whose Case comes now to be considered.

Page. 2.

The Author observes that upon the Deposing of S. *Chrysostom*, *Asfacius* was placed in his See, who in fourteen months time must be supposed to Ordain Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; or if he did not, yet *Atticus* succeeded him, whilst S. *Chrysostom* was yet alive and in Exile. *Atticus* sat as Patriarch twenty years, and yet all his Ordinations were never questioned, but were received by the Church, as if they had been Canonical. *Atticus* was succeeded

by *Sisinnius*, and he by *Nestorius*; and both *Atticus* and *Sisinnius* were owned as Patriarchs by *Celestine* Bishop of Rome in an Epistle to *Nestorius*; and in the General Council of *Ephesus* no exceptions were made to the Promotions of the Patriarchs of *Constantinople*, only *Nestorius* himself was Deposed for Heresie. To enforce all this yet further, the Writer of the Preface cites some passages out of the life of S. *Chrysostom* written by *Palladius*, to shew what the Opinion of that Father was in his own Case, and how far he was from insisting upon any Right he had to be acknowledged still, as Patriarch, when he was once Deposed. For, says he, *S. Chrysostom* advised and charged the Bishops his Friends more than once, That as they loved Christ, none of them should leave his Church upon his account: That they must keep Communion with his Deposers, and not rend and divide the Church. And he enjoyed some devout Women that attended there, that as they hoped to obtain Mercy from God, they should pay the same Service and Good will to his Successor by a fair Election, that they had done to himself: for the Church could not be without a Bishop.

But this notwithstanding, upon examination we shall find that S. *Chrysostom* was clearly of another mind, than he is here represented to be of, and that there is nothing in his Case, which will in the least favour this Authors Doctrine. I have already observed, how much contrary S. *Chrysostom* acted to these Principles in the case of *Meletius*, and I shall now make it appear, that he was evidently against them in his own.

The account *Palladius* gives us is *Palladius*: this: S. *Chrysostom* before his first Banishment, when he perceived what violent Methods his Adversaries would take; spoke to the forty Bishops, who were

were met with him : That as they loved Christ none of them would leave his Church upon his account : *For, says he, I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand, in S. Paul's words. I shall undergo many Sufferings, I see, and so depart this life. And afterwards; To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain, and, am I better than the Patriarchs, than the Prophets and Apostles, that I should be immortal?* From whence it is plain that he was very apprehensive that his Enemies had a design upon his life, and that they would not suffer him to live much longer : (c) *For it was commonly reported that he was to be beheaded.* At this one of them expressed, how much they were troubled for the Desolation and Confusion that would befall the Church, when wicked Men should Usurp the Government of it. Upon which he again exhorts them not to forsake their Churches: *For, says he, Preaching did not begin with me, nor will it end with me: did not Moses die? And was not Joshua appointed to succeed him? Did not Samuel die? And was not David anointed? Jeremiah departed this life, but did he not leave Baruch behind? Elijah was taken up into Heaven, but then did not Elisha Prophecy? S. Paul was beheaded, but did he not leave Timothy, Titus, Apollos, and innumerable others behind him?* When he had said this, Eusebius, Bishop of *Apamea in Bithynia* puts him in mind, that if they retained their Churches they must be forced to Communicate, and to Subscribe to the Deposing him: to which *S. Chrysostom* answers, that he would have them hold Communion to prevent a Schism in the Church, but by

no means to Subscribe; for he was conscious to himself of nothing for which he ought to be Deposed, or thrust out of his See. Just before his second Banishment, he speaks to *Olympias* the Deaconess with some others, saying, *I see the things concerning me have an end, I have finished my Course, and probably you will never see my face more: this one thing I desire of you, that none of you omit your accustomed Good-will and attendance upon the Church; and whoever shall be Ordained without his own seeking, and (d) against his desire, by a general consent, that you would obey him, as you would do me: for the Church cannot be without a Bishop.*

It is evident both from the Words themselves, and from the Circumstances in which he spoke them, that *S. Chrysostom* both times looked upon himself as a dying Man, when he used these words in taking his leave of the Bishops, and of the Deaconesses, and therefore they cannot import, that he would have them submit to a Bishop, who should succeed him during his life.

But if we allow the words their utmost Latitude, and take them in the greatest extent that they will possibly admit of, they can amount to no more than this, not that they should submit to any Bishop, who should succeed him, whilst he was living; but to one, who should not be desirous or fond of it, but should come in against his own inclinations, and by an unanimous consent; by which we can understand no less, than that he means one, who was not of the Party against him, nor had

(c) Ἐδουλεύετο γὰρ ὑπερήκοον,  
See. Pallad. p. 68.

(d) Καὶ ὅς ἄν ἄλλον ἀχθῇ ἐπὶ τῇ χειροτονίᾳ, μὴ ἐμυλίσσας τὸ πρεσβυτεῖον, καὶ συναίρεσιν ἡμῶν πάντων. Ibid. p. 90.

any hand in thrusting him out; and if such an one were chosen unanimously, who was a friend to his Cause, and lamented the great injustice done him, and who unwillingly and upon necessity only could be prevailed upon to fill the See, and who therefore must have been as willing to have given way to him, as the true Patriarch, if ever he should have returned; if such an one were chosen; (and such an one he must be, if he were chosen by general consent: for never any Bishops departure was more grievous to all but the Faction that Deposed him, than *S. Chrysostom's* was) then, according to this Sense of his words, he advises them not to divide the Church upon his account, but to join in Communion with such a Bishop, since this was the only means to preserve the Churches Peace. Which is a conditional Relinquishment, or a Declaration that he would forgoe his own Right upon condition that such a Bishop were chosen as he there mentions. But, if we suppose this to be *S. Chrysostom's* meaning, the See was disposed of to men, who were very far from being such Bishops as he exhorted them to submit to. For all his Friends endured great hardships

*Pallad. p. 95.*  
*Soz. lib. 8. c. 27.*  
*Phot. Biblioth. Cod. 277.*

under *Arfacius*, and *Articus* had been the chief Incendiary against him. And this is the excuse which *Photius* makes for some Expressions, that seemed to him a little too severe, which *S. Chrysostom* used concerning *Arfacius* in an Epistle to *Cyriacus*.

And to be convinced that *S. Chrysostom* did not design that they should submit to any Bishop, that should be set up, we need only consider that these very Persons, to whom he gave this in charge, never would submit either to *Arfacius* or *Articus*, at least during his Life; but suffered all that they could do to them, rather than they would comply, and *S. Chrysostom* wrote many Epistles to these very Bishops and

Deaconesses, to comfort and support them under the severe afflictions, which they endured upon this account: And when *Palladius* himself, and so many other Bishops, with the rest of the Clergy suffered so much in *S. Chrysostom's* Cause, as is mentioned in his Life, it is past all belief, that neither any of the rest, nor *Palladius*, who is supposed to be the Author of this account of his Life, and was one of those Bishops to whom *S. Chrysostom* gave these directions, should call to mind what he had said to them; but the Bishops as well as Deaconesses should with one consent act contrary to what *S. Chrysostom* in his last words required of them, and should either mistake him, or forget what he had said, or should choose to suffer any thing rather than observe his advice, and do what he had told them was their Duty. But as his Friends could not have so little respect for him, or so little care of themselves, as to forget so soon, what it would have been so much for their own ease and safety to remember: so he would not have failed in some one of his Epistles at least to put them in mind of it, and would never have let them suffer so much, contrary to that Duty, which his last words inculcated to them, taking no care afterwards to remind them, what God and the Church required of them. If he had never heard of their condition, or had never had an opportunity to write to them about it, it is scarce possible they should misunderstand him so, as to run themselves into such needless, and indeed sinful sufferings; but when he held a Correspondence with them in his Banishment, and wrote so often upon this very Subject, it is incredible that they should suffer for not doing that, which he had exhorted them to do, and that he among all his Consolations should forget that which would alone have given them effectual and



and present relief, and should omit to tell them, that they suffered when they needed not, and in a Cause, in which they could not suffer with a good Conscience.

*Chryſoſt.* But this is not all : S. Chryſoſtom  
*Epist.* 26. does not only omit to tell them, that  
27. they needed not, and ought not to suffer,

*Ep.* 36. 46. but applauds them for suffering  
71. 90. in so good a Cause, and exhorts them to perseverance, and applies those Scriptures to them, which pronounce blessings upon those, who suffer for Righteousness sake : He tells them they ought not to value their lives in such a Cause, being certain of a reward in Heaven. He (c) extols the Apostolical Courage and Constancy of the Bishops and Clergy, who were in Prison, and compares them to S. John Baptist, both in their Sufferings and in the justness of their Cause ; and represents it, as a more glorious thing to suffer so much, and so long for the Vindication of the Primitive Constitutions and Discipline, than it was for him to be beheaded for telling Herod, that it was not lawful for him to have his Brother Philip's Wife : S. John Baptist suffered but once ; but he bids them say, *we are ready to suffer ten thousand Deaths rather than comply with the*

*Ep.* 99.

*Ep.* 126.

*Usurper* συκοφαντοῦν ὃν αἰρέματα, ἀλλ' ἐποθέσκειν μυριάδας. He exhorts the Bishop and Clergy of Scythopolis to avoid, as to their own Honour, and the Benefit of the Church they had already done, all those, who had filled the World with Confusions, and had brought such divisions into the Church :

(c) Μαχέοις καὶ ἐν δισμῶν ὑμεῖς, καὶ τὸ γένος, μεθ' ἧς φέρετε τὰ δισμὰ, ἐπελκιστὴν ἀνδρείαν ἐν τέτοις ὁπιδεικνύμενοι, &c. *Ep.* 83. Μαχέοις τὸ δισμωπείας καὶ τὸ ἀλύσιτος, καὶ τὸ ἐν δισμῶν ὑποδύσας ὑμεῖς μαχέοις καὶ τεισμάρεται, &c. *Ep.* 85.

and he writes to the Bishop of Jerusalem to the same purpose, and almost in the same words. In his Epistle to Cyriacus, (f) I have heard, says he, of \* that vain Man Arsacius, whom the Empress has placed in the Episcopal Throne, that he has afflicted the Brethren, and the Virgins, who would not Communicate with him ; and many of them have died in Prison for my sake. For he is a Wolf in Sheep's clothing, and has the Habit of a Bishop, but is an Adulterer ; for as a Woman is called an Adulteress, who is married to another Man, whilst her Husband is living, so he is not a Carnal but a Spiritual Adulterer ; for he has usurped my See, whilst I am alive. It is doubtful, I confess, whether this Epistle to Cyriacus be genuine ; for it is rejected both by Mr. Hales and Mr. Boys in their Notes upon it, and these expressions concerning Arsacius, are alledged by Mr. Hales as one reason, why he thinks it cannot be S. Chryſoſtom's : but Mr. Boys says, he should the rather be inclined to think it genuine, because of these expressions, and he answers all the other Objections against it, rejecting it himself only upon the account of the Style. I shall only say,

(f) \* ἤκουσα γὰρ ἡγεῖναι τοῦ τῷ \* λήρου Ἀρσακίου ἐκείνου, ὃν ἐπέθεσαν ἡ Βασίλισσα ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ, ὅτι, ἔδειξε πρὸς ἀδελφούς καὶ τὰς παρθένους μὴ δεχέσθαι αὐτῷ κοινωνήσαι πολλοὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ δι' ἐμὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ εὐλακῇ ἀπέθανον. ὁ γὰρ ἐπελάβημεν ἐκείνου, ὁ γῆμα μὴ ἔχον ὁποῖον, μοιχὸς δὲ διαβόλων· ἵτι γὰρ ἡ γυνὴ μοιχαλὶς χρεματίζει, ἡ ζῶντι τῷ ἀνδρὶ, ἔτιερῳ ἀνδρὶ σωματεύουσα. ἔγω καὶ τῷ μοιχῷ ἔην, ὡς σαρὰ ἀλλὰ πνέματι ζῶντι γὰρ ἐμὲ, ἡρεπάσμε τὸν θρόνον τὸ ἐκκλησιῶν. *Ep.* 143.

\* Or, *was* Dotard, for *λῆρος* signifies the Dotage of old Age.

that



that there are so many Accidents, which may make any Authors stile different at different times, especially in his familiar Letters, and those written in Banishment, and perhaps under the disorders of sickness and dangers, which S. Chrysostom so often complains of, that this Censure from the Stile must be the less certain, especially since Photius could not discern but that it was genuine, tho he took notice of this very passage concerning Arfacius and defends it. But suppose it not to be genuine, yet it is very ancient, and was written probably by one, who lived in S. Chrysostom's time, and was not unacquainted with his sense of these things.

Ep. 148.

S. Chrysostom having put another Bishop in mind of the reward, which he would certainly receive for his sufferings in another World, takes off that Objection, which might be made from the smallness of their number; and tells him, that if they would shew themselves courageous, they would be too hard for those, who were more in number, and boasted themselves in their wickedness; that God would be their help and assistance, if they would but do their Duty, and that they were engaged in a Cause, which concerned all the Churches in the World. But that which yet further shews S. Chrysostom's mind in this matter is; that, the Bishop, whom he had Consecrated and sent to the Gothes, being dead, he takes care to provide another Bishop for them, and is very solicitous, that one should not be Ordained and sent thither by Arfacius; or Atticus, so that he not only looked upon himself as the only rightful Patriarch, but acted as such in his Banishment.

Ep. 13. ad  
Omp.

We see, that S. Chrysostom was very far from advising, or so much as coniving at a compliance with the Usurpation of the Bishop, that had possessed himself of his See. He commended, and encouraged those that

would not Communicate with him, he comforted them, with the expectation of Rewards in Heaven, for whatever they could suffer here in a Cause, which was so pleasing to God, and upon which depended the good of the whole Christian Church; he called Arfacius by name a Wolf in Sheeps clothing, (if the Epistle to Cyriacus be genuine) and took upon himself Episcopal Authority, even in his Exile; he encouraged all every where to stand out against the Usurper, by his Epistles, which he sent to the Eastern Bishops and to those of the West; to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, who were imprisoned, and to persons of both Sexes, and of all Orders and Degrees: for the greatest part of his Epistles are upon this Subject, and yet there is not one word of submission or compliance; but the most earnest and passionate Exhortations to the contrary, from all the motives which he could use, that concern either this or another life. And there is much more to the same purpose in (g) a Discourse which he wrote in his Exile, to remove the scandal some took by reason of the Persecution, the Church then lay under.

The Author of the Preface confesses, that the Western Churches did a long time refuse Communion with some Bishops, that had conspired against S. Chrysostom. He should have said, as Theodorite, whom he quotes soon after, does, that they would not hold Communion with the Bishops of Egypt, and of the East, nor with those upon the Bosphorus, and of Thrace, till they had Registered the name of S. Chrysostom among the rest of the Patriarchs deceased. But he says, that in this case the renouncing Communion was only, as it were, a breaking off a Correspondence. Suppose it were

(g) Chryl. Προς τὸν Σαβαστιανόν, c. 19. & 23.

C

no

no more; yet it cannot be shown that it was ever thought lawful for one Patriarch to break off Correspondence thus with another, but upon such Reasons as would justify a separation in Bishops from their own Patriarch. But it was not barely a not Corresponding with *Asfacius* and *Atticus*: for the Western Church not only espoused *S. Chrysostom's* Cause, but did approve of the proceedings of those who suffered for it, and were not backward to declare that they had done well in not Communicating with the new Patriarchs; they denied that these had any Episcopal Authority, or ought to be owned as Patriarchs during the life of *S. Chrysostom*.

*Sozom. l. 8. c. 26. Pallad. p. 214, &c.*

But most of the Eastern Bishops would not renounce Communion, though they would not be accessory to that unjust Deprivation. This, I confess, *Theodorit* says: and it is no wonder that in the East many, who declared for the Justice of *S. Chrysostom's* Cause, and against the proceedings of his Enemies, should be wrought upon by Terrors and Punishments; whereas those in the West acted unanimously, being under no such hard Circumstances to awe them to a compliance. And this makes *S. Chrysostom* in one of his Epistles purposely take off that Objection, from the smallness of their number. But though the Bishops in the East did not so generally refuse to Communicate with the Deposing Bishops, as they did in the West, yet that very many did refuse to do it, is evident; for the Prisons were filled with them: and many of these who refused, were Bishops of the chiefest Sees: for the Bishops of *Jerusalem*, *Chryf. Ep. 26, 27. 126.* and *Thessalonica*, and in general the Bishops of all *Macedon* were of the number, besides many others of lesser Note, or whose Sees are not mentioned.

*Socr. l. 7. c. 25.*

But *Atticus* at last began to relent, or was forced to relax his Rigour,

and to Register the name of *S. Chrysostom* in the *Diptychs* of the Church, endeavouring by this means to bring over the *Joannites*, as they were called, who asserted his Cause. And when *S. Chrysostom* had been so long time dead, and this Right had been done to his memory, it is no wonder, that *Atticus* and *Sisinnius* should have the Titles of Patriarchs given them, and that the Council of *Ephesus* should take no notice of the Injustice, that *S. Chrysostom* had done him, when both He, and those that had done it were dead, and their names were read together in the *Diptychs*; when the *Joannites* had had this satisfaction given them, and there was no Man now alive, who could pretend any injury done him by the Promotion of the present Patriarch, it could not become the Wisdom and the Charity of a General Council to revive the memory of a thing, which after so long a time could admit of no Remedy, but what might be of worse Consequence, and might increase and prolong the Divisions, which now were much abated, and soon after ceased.

The Western Churches had long before the Council of *Ephesus* renewed Communion with the Eastern, when once *S. Chrysostom's* name was written among the names of the other Patriarchs deceased. For they never took any notice of *Asfacius* at all, and rejected all the Messages that *Atticus* sent to get himself acknowledged by them, till he had made this amends to the Memory of *S. Chrysostom*. But, as *Theodorit* observes, these Bishops, who were thus injurious to *S. Chrysostom*, were otherwise excellent Men, and there was nothing else to be found in them, which might deserve the Churches Censure, and therefore, after the Church had been satisfied, as to this matter, they were mentioned with those Titles, that were due to their Station,

*Theod. l. 5. c. 34.*

Conc.  
Ephes.  
Part 1.  
col. 353.  
361.

Station, and to their Vertues. For the Titles which *Celestine* gives to *Atticus* and *Sisinnius* in his Epistle to *Nestorius*, are only such as suppose, their names to be written in the Diptycks among the other Patriarchs, and that they were assertors of the Catholick Faith: he supposes *Atticus* at last to have been the Rightful Patriarch, and consequently *Sisinnius*, who succeeded him by a Canonical Election, to have been so too; and he highly commends both of them for their zeal in maintaining the true Faith, which *Nestorius*, the next in Succession, had so shamefully betrayed. *Atticus*, after the death of *S. Chrysostom* and *Sisinnius*, who succeeded him, were in their times the only Patriarchs of *Constantinople*, and tho' *Arsacius* and *Atticus* had not come in regularly, yet it was in the Power of the Church, upon due satisfaction made, for the sake of Peace and Order, to pass by such a defect, and dispense with it; and when *Atticus* had Registered *S. Chrysostom's* name in the Diptycks as Rightful Patriarch, this was in effect to acknowledge himself to have been an Usurper, during his life; which was accepted of by the Church as a sufficient Declaration of his Repentance: and, as it has been already shewn, Hereticks themselves upon their Repentance were to be received not only to Lay Communion, but according to their Order and Degree in the Church. If our Author could have shewn that *Celestine* had said as much of *Arsacius*, as he has done of *Atticus* and *Sisinnius*, that had been to his purpose, because *S. Chrysostom* survived *Arsacius*; but it is acknowledged, that after the death of *S. Chrysostom*, *Atticus* was at last Rightful Patriarch, and owned by the Western Church for such.

What is added of *Maximian* and *Proclus* that they were acknowledged as Rightful Patriarchs by the Church,

needs no other Answer, than what has been already given; for if *Atticus* were Rightful, the rest who succeeded him were such too; if no other exception lay against them, than that, concerning what had been done to *S. Chrysostom*. But besides, *Maximian* was made Patriarch in the room of *Nestorius* in the General Council of *Ephesus*; and this surely was enough to purge all defects in the Succession of the Patriarchs of *Constantinople*. For where a General Council does not only approve of, but appoint the Successor of a Bishop Deposed for Heresie, it can no longer be pretended, that there remains any defect upon the account of injustice done to a Patriarch, who had been so long dead; for if the Succession had been interrupted till now from the time that *S. Chrysostom* was Deposed, yet this would put it in its due course again. *Proclus* who is next mentioned, and was next in Succession to *Maximian*, had been bred up under *S. Chrysostom*, and could little suspect that he should ever have been reckoned among his uncanonical Successors: for as *Atticus* had inserted his name among the other Patriarchs, so *Proclus* was zealous to make him all the further reparation, that could be made, by causing his Body to be removed to *Constantinople*, and there inter'd with all the Honours of a Funeral solemnity.

If *Severianus* Bishop of *Gabala*, *Pag. 4.* and *Acacius* Bishop of *Berrhea*, being afterwards discovered to Pope Innocent, were neither deposed, nor reprehended by him: The reason must be, that that Pope did not assume to himself so much as his Successors have done, but said he would procure a General Council to be called to redress the Grievances of the *Greek* Church upon this account, and at the same time denies all Authority in *Arsacius*, as being an Intruder. Nay, in



an ( *b* ) Epistle written to the Emperour *Arcadius*, he Deposed *Arfacius* after his death, or declared him never to have been Patriarch, and commanded his name to be razed out of the Diptychs; and in the same Epistle Excommunicated *Arcadius* himself, and the Emperess *Eudoxia*, and both Deposed, and Anathematized and Excommunicated *Theophilus* of *Alexandria*.

*Blondell.* I will not suppose that this Epistle  
*Pseudo.* to *Arcadius* deserves much Credit,  
*Isid* p 562 for it is rejected by *Blondel*, because  
*Georg.* *Georgius Alexandrinus* is the first that  
*Alex. vit.* produces it, from whom *Glycas* and  
*Chrys.* c. 68 *Nicephorus* had it, and before them  
*Mich.* both *Cedrenus* made mention of it.  
*Glyc. An.* And whereas Pope Innocent in this E-  
*Part 4 p.* pistle, wherein *S. Chrysostom* is men-  
tioned as already dead, threatens *Eudoxia*  
*159.* the Emperess with Punishments  
*Niceph.* in this World as well as in the World  
*113. c. 34* to come, it is noted in the Margin over  
*Cedren.* against this Epistle in *Labbe's* Edition  
*p. 332.* of the Councils, that *Eudoxia*,  
*Conc. Tom.* died before *S. Chrysostom*, which is a  
*2. Col.* plain intimation that the Epistle is Spu-  
*1310.* rious. But I produce this Epistle to  
observe, that if it could pass for Au-  
thentick in the several Ages in which  
these Authors lived, it is in vain to  
endeavour to make it be believed,  
that the Practice of the *Greek*  
Church was all along such as our Au-  
thor pretends: for when Men would  
impose any Spurious writing upon the  
World, they cannot hope to make it  
be received for genuine, but by giving

it as near a Resemblance to Truth as  
they can devise, and that commonly  
they do by copying out some of the  
Customs of their own time; for what  
Men see done in one Age, they are the  
more easily induced to think was done  
before: but it is too impudent a For-  
gery to invent a writing, which con-  
tains things plainly contrary to the  
Practice both of their own and all  
foregoing Ages; a Man can never ex-  
pect to be believed in such a Story, or  
that any will venture to repeat it after  
him. So that we must conclude, that  
this Epistle was agreeable to the Prac-  
tice of the Church in *Georgius Alex-  
andrinus's* time, who lived in the se-  
venth Century, and that *Glycas* in the  
twelfth, and *Nicephorus* in the four-  
teenth saw nothing absurd in it: but  
as *Blondel* has observed, that part of  
it, which concerns the Excommuni-  
cation of *Arcadius* and *Eudoxia* is  
not mentioned by *Cedrenus*, which  
makes him suspect it was foisted in  
after his time: for all Forgeries as  
they are designed commonly to serve  
some turn or other, so they seldom  
fail to be suited to the abuses of the  
times in which they are made.

But it is confessed that not only Pope  
*Innocent*, but the whole Western  
Church did refuse Communion with  
the Deposing Bishops, and it is further  
observable, that when, after the death  
of *Flavianus* Bishop of *Antioch*, who  
had not consented to the Deposing of  
*S. Chrysostom*, *Porphyrus* succeeded  
him, who agreed to it, many of *Syria*  
broke off Communion with that Church.

Our Author next observes, that *P. 5, 6.*  
whereas *Dioscorus* in the second Coun-  
cil of *Ephesus* absolved *Eutyches*, and  
Deposed *Flavianus*, and then mur-  
dered him, and Consecrated *Anatolius*  
in his room: none of these Bishops, who  
concurred and acted with *Dioscorus*  
in the unjust ejection of *Flavianus*,  
and the unlawful Ordination of *Ana-  
tolius*

( *h* ) 'Ουδὲ γὰρ πώποτε πατὴρ ἢ  
πατήρων ἢ ἡμετέρων τοιαῦτα τετα-  
μῆσθαι ἐγκρίναμεν· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον κακώ-  
λυθαι τὸ μνημεῖον εἰς τόπον ζῶντος  
χειροτονῆν ἄλλον δεδεδωκεν ἕξασιν· ὃ  
γὰρ χειροτονία ἀδοκιμῶς τῷ πνεύματι  
ἀφελείᾳ τῶ ἱερῶς ἐπειδή ποτε ὁ  
ἐπίσκοπος διώκεται ἢ ἐκείνῳ, ὃς  
ἀδίκως ἕτοιμασθαι. *Innocentii Epist.*  
*apud Sozom. lib. 8. c. 26.*



tolius in his place, were rejected in the fourth General Council of Chalcedon, only Eutyches and Dioscorus. that persisted in their Heresie. For that Holy Synod concerned not it self about the Ordinations of uncanonical and illegal Patriarchs, but only required of every one the Profession of the Orthodox Faith.

By this representation of the Case, he would have it believed, that no Objection was made against the Bishops, who concurred with *Dioscorus* in the second Council of *Ephesus*, for having concurred with him; but that the Profession of the Orthodox Faith was only required of them, and so they were forthwith received by the Council. Which is so far from being true, that tho they had owned their fault in Deposing *Flavianus* Patriarch of *Constantinople* and *Eusebius* Bishop of *Doryleum*, and were as forward as any to make Profession of the true Faith, yet it was moved in the Council of *Chalcedon* by the Judges, or Officers sent by the Emperor to inspect and regulate the Proceedings there, that *Juvenalis* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, *Thalasius* Bishop of *Cesarea* in *Capadocia*, *Eusebius* Bishop of *Ancyra*, *Enstasius* Bishop of *Berytus*, and *Bril* Bishop of *Selenicia* in *Isauria*, (i) should be put under the same Censure with *Dioscorus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, and should according to the Canons be deprived of their See's: which was assented to by the Bishops of the East, who said it was a *just* { *k* } Sentence; they agreed that it was just to reject those Bishops, whose names I have now recited, and who are the same, that our Author by name

(i) **T**<sup>6</sup> **ἡ** **ἀποστολή** **ἐκ** **καταστάσεως** **ἐν** **τῇ** **ἐκκλησίᾳ**.  
Conc. Chalced. Act. 1. Col 323. Euagr.  
lib. 2. c. 18. p. 313.

(k) Δικαία κρίσις. ib. Conc. Ch'c.  
Δικαία ψήφισις, Euagr. ib.

sets down as not rejected in the fourth General Council, only he has left out *Eusebius* Bishop of *Ancyra*, and inserted *Photius* Bishop of *Isauria* in *Epirus*, or, as the Publisher has Corrected it, *Photius* Bishop of *Tyre*. If he means, they were not finally rejected, he says true, but then he ought not to have concealed, that they were not received in the first *Actions* of that Council, nor upon what grounds they were at last admitted; but these are such as will not be at all serviceable to his Cause. They took their places indeed among the rest of the Bishops at the opening of the Council, but so did *Dioscorus* himself too, tho it was objected against by the Bishop of *Rome's* Legats, who were over-ruled, it being thought reasonable that they should retain their Places till their Cause was heard; for to displace them before might seem to be a Prejudging them. But upon examination it appeared, that the case of these Bishops could deserve nothing but commiseration from the Council: some of them, *S. Basil* of *Seleucia* by name, had *Conc.* made profession of the true Faith in *Chald.* the Synod of *Ephesus* it self, wherein *Col.* 137. *Dioscorus* presided; and at last what 229. they did in concurrence with him, was by compulsion: for they were surrounded with armed Soldiers, who offered violence to them, and forced them to Subscribe a Blank Paper, which was afterwards filled up; (*l*) as they pleaded for themselves, and as *Eusebius* Bishop of (*m*) *Dorylaeum* like-

(1) Ἀγέθῳ χάριτι πάντας ἑσ-  
 γέλασθε βίας τε καὶ ἀνάγκης,  
 μὲντοι χαλοῖς ἀσπλυνήσαντες, σπαινωμένοι  
 αὐτοῖς καὶ φονικῶν ὀργάνων ἀσπαινωσάν-  
 των. *Evang. ib. p. 311. Conc. Chald.*  
*Act. i Col 129 251.*

(m) Καὶ ὡς ἀγαθὸς χάρτις παρ-  
εστίασεν αὐτῷ κατακλινασθῆναι, (Diof)  
Euaer.p 314 Con.Chal Act.3 Col 3S2.  
wife

wife testified. So that when this affair came again under debate, the Council was very compassionate to these offending Bishops, in consideration of the hard Circumstances, in which the Offence (n) was committed; and therefore they desired that they might be suffered to receive the *Five Bishops* as Members of the Council, and the Emperour being first acquainted with their request, by his permission they were restored.

What then can we conclude from hence more than that the Authority of a General Council may be sufficient upon so reasonable Motives to restore Bishops, who by the Canons have forfeited their Sees? But it is a very wrong account of this matter, to say barely, that *none of those Bishops were rejected in the fourth General Council of Chalcedon*: for they were rejected at first, or else there would have been no debate concerning their Case, when once they would Subscribe the Orthodox Faith; but tho they profered to do this, they had like to have lain under the same condemnation with *Discorus*, so far as it concerned his being Deposed from his See: and it was upon considerations peculiar to their Case, and which in all equity ought to be admitted of in abatement to the Rigour of the Letter of the Canons, that they were at last accepted: for if there had been no more in their Case than what our Author has thought fit to take notice of, they had, as it appears, been absolutely rejected.

But he says, that *Anatolius* was uncanonically advanced to the See of *Constantinople*, and the Synod concerned not it self about such Matters, requiring only of every one the Profession of the Orthodox Faith.

(n) Conc. Chalced. Act. 1. Col. 509. *Euagr. ib. p. 324.*

He seems to suppose here, that *Anatolius* was constituted Patriarch by *Discorus* in the second Council of *Ephesus* in the room of *Flavianus*; *Liberat. Breviar. c. 12.* which cannot be true; for he was not Patriarch till after the death of *Flavianus*, and *Flavianus* died in Prison after the Synod. If it had been otherwise, *Leo* Bishop of *Rome* could not have been uncertain, as he writes to (o) *Theodosius*, he was, whether the Promotion of *Anatolius* were uncanonical or no; it being notorious that all must be uncanonical, which was done in prejudice to an Orthodox Patriarch's Right, by an Heretical Bishop in an Heretical Synod: And besides, if he had been made Patriarch in the second Council of *Ephesus*, he had been Deposed by the Council of *Chalcedon* in which himself presided: for all the Acts of that Council of *Ephesus* are declared void in the General Council of *Chalcedon*, excepting only the Ordination of *Maximus* Bishop of *Antioch*. *Euagr. ib. p. 328.*

But because this Author says, that that Holy Synod concerned not it self about the Ordinations of uncanonical and illegal Patriarchs. I shall bring a remarkable instance to shew, that that Council did concern it self about uncanonical Ordinations, which may convince us, that if *Anatolius* had been uncanonically Ordained, it would have been insisted upon: For there was at that time a contest between *Bassianus* and *Stephanus* concerning the Bishoprick of *Ephesus*; and the Council upon

(o) De Ordinatione ejus, qui Constantinopolitana Ecclesie caput praesidere nihil interim in alterutram partem temere rescribendum putavi, non dilectionem negans, sed manifestationem Catholicae veritatis expectans. Epist. Leon. ad Theodof. Conc. Chalced. Col. 59.

*Conc. Chal.* examination finding that the Pretensions of both of them were contrary to the Canons, Deposed them both and appointed a third Bishop to be Consecrated, tho' *Bassianus* had been in Possession of that See four years; which shews how little our Author's Principles were thought of in that Council. And to make it yet further manifest, how little this Author knew of the Council of *Chalcedon*, when he says, that only *Eutyches* and *Dioscorus* were rejected there, who persisted in their Heresie: *Anatolius* expressly declared in the Council, that *Dioscorus* was not Deposed for Heresie, but because he had Excommunicated *Leo* Bishop of *Rome*, and had refused to appear, when he was thrice summoned.

*Eusgr. l. 2.  
cap. 18.  
p. 327.*

*Page 6.* The next Instances, which he brings, are in Reign of the Emperour *Anastatius*, who, he says, Deposed three Patriarchs of *Constantinople*, which when he proceeds to give an account of, he insists upon his Deposing of *Euphemius* and *Macedonius* only, saying that the great *Elias* Bishop of *Jerusalem* embraced the Communion of all these three Patriarchs, when all were alive together, that is, he embraced the Communion of *Euphemius*, *Macedonius*, and *Timotheus*, the two last being preferred to that See contrary to the Canons; but if *Timotheus* was uncanonically Deposed too, as he said, why did he not inform us how he behaved himself towards his Successor? tho' indeed it is to little purpose to concern our selves what uncanonical Bishops did: for they could have no pretence to break off Communion from their Successors, who came in by as good a Right, as they had done themselves.

*Page 7.*

However he tells us, that when *Anastatius* had Deposed *Euphemius*, because he would not embrace the Heresie of the *Acephali*, and Anathematize the the fourth General Council, and Com-

municate with *Severus* Bishop of *Antioch*, and had set up *Macedonius*, in his room; *Euphemius* did not depart from the Communion of his unlawful Successor, because he held the Catholic Faith; and so likewise that *Macedonius*, when he was Deposed for the same Reasons, held Communion with *Timotheus*, who succeeded him, because he was Orthodox. He says that *Elias* Bishop of *Jerusalem* held Communion in like manner with all these three Patriarchs, and that when the same Emperour had Deposed and Banished the said *Elias*, because he would not be brought over to his Heretical Opinions, and constituted *John* in his place, *Elias* continued Communion with him, because he proved Orthodox, as did likewise the two famous Monks *Theodosius* and *Sabas*.

I answer, it does not appear, whether *Euphemius* did Communicate with his two Successors or not; but it is this Authors custom to make his advantage of the silence of Historians, and to conclude that the Deposed Bishops did Communicate with their Successors, only because the Historians do not positively say the contrary, whereas no such thing ought to be concluded, as I shall afterwards shew. And it is not probable that *Euphemius* did Communicate with *Macedonius*: for *Euphemius* had lately assembled a Synod purposely to confirm the fourth General Council, whereas *Macedonius* Subscribed *Zeno's* Henoticon, the design of which was to lay aside the Authority of the fourth General Council, which was next to the condemning it.

But supposing that *Euphemius* did Communicate with both his Successors, as *Cyrillus* of *scythopolis* informs us, *Elias* did; yet if we consider the extraordinary Circumstances of that time, and the peculiar Reasons, that might induce them both to it, this will not prove the general Assertion, which this Author



Author lays down, *That not one of those Bishops that were unjustly deposed, did ever separate himself from the Communion of the Church, upon the account of his being deposed, provided that he that was uncanonically promoted after him, was Orthodox.* But this will only be an Exception to the general Practice, and so will prove the quite contrary, to what he would prove by it.

*Sabel's.*

*per Cyrill.*

*Scythop.*

*c. 50.*

*Enagr. l. 3.*

*c. 30.*

The Church at that time was miserably over-run with Heresies and Schisms; and the Emperor himself being a zealous Heretick, the Orthodox Bishops were forced to be contented to submit to great Inconveniencies, and not to insist upon their Right and Authority, so they could but secure an Orthodox Succession in their Sees; they saw, it was impossible for them to keep in themselves, and the next thing they desired was to have an Orthodox Successor, who probably never would have been prevailed with to assume the Throne, without the rightful Patriarchs consent, and when he was in it, still owned the former. as him who had the just Title to it: Which might make *Euphemius*, when he was to be sent into Banishment, desire that *Macedonius* would undertake for his safe conduct; and when *Macedonius*, by the Emperors leave, went to give him assurance of it, he commanded his Deacon first to take off his Episcopal Robe, and so he went into the Baptistry to *Euphemius*; and besides borrowed Money to present him with for himself and his Attendants. This is a sufficient evidence both of his respect for *Euphemius*, and of his acknowledging him to have the Authority still, notwithstanding his own advancement to the See. And in these Cases it was scarce greater force upon the Bishop that was deposed, than upon him that was promoted; but they by consent did what they saw most advantageous

for the Church in those difficult Circumstances, thinking it no time for the Orthodox to divide from one another, when their Number was so small in comparison of the Hereticks, who had a zealous Emperor at the head of them.

The case was the same in the Depri- *Vit. Sabas*  
vation of *Elias* Bishop of *Jerusalem*; *John*, his Successor, had promised the Emperor to anathematize the Council of *Chalcedon*, but was prevailed upon by the Orthodox, to make profession of the True Faith; for which he was cast into Prison, and was to have been banished, but the *Sabas* and the rest of the Monks petitioned the Emperor to keep him in the See, knowing that it was impossible to get *Elias* restored, and that if *John* were cast out for being Orthodox, the next in Succession must of consequence be an Heretick.

This then only proves, that there has been such a Case, when, to prevent Heresies in the Church, Bishops have resigned their Sees, or at least have contented that others should succeed them; but this is so far from being an Argument, that in all Cases, and without their consent, an Usurper ought to be communicated with, in prejudice to the Authority of the true Bishop, that it plain'y proves the contrary. *St. Gregory Nazianzene* for the like Reasons resigned the Bishoprick of *C. P.* saying, that he was contented to be the *Jonas*, who should be thrown over-board, to allay the Storms that threatned the Church: But can we from hence conclude, that *Nectarius*, his Successor, would have been owned by the Church as Patriarch of *C. P.* if *St. Gregory* had not resigned? Or must we not rather conclude, that the Church would never have acknowledged him. And like this seems to have been the Case of the *Jews* under the *Romans*; the High Priest by right of Succession receding,

*Theodor.*

*Leit. l. 2.*

*Vit.*  
*Arba*  
*p. 48.*

*Socr. l.*  
*c. 38.*

*Hieron.*  
*Chron.*



receding, and being glad upon any terms to preserve the true Religion and Worship of God, rather than with the whole Jewish Nation to be deprived of it, under Heathen Governments.

Hitherto our Author has spoken only of the Patriarchs of C. P. excepting that he occasionally mentioned *Meletius* upon the account of *St. Chrysostom* and *Elias*, on occasion of *Euphemius*. But after he has proceeded thus far, he takes a large step back again to inform us, that *St. Cyrill*, Bishop of *Jerusalem* came into that See contrary to the Canons, being by *Arians* put into the room of *Maximus*, who was thrust out, for having taken part with *St. Athanasius*. Now *St. Cyrill*, says he, was, notwithstanding upon his Conversion to the Orthodox Faith, acknowledged for Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, and even *Maximus* himself did not withdraw from *Cyrill's* Communion.

For the proof of all this, he refers to the Life of *St. Athanasius*, whereas the Author of his Life only says that *Acacius* and *Patrophilus* thrust *Maximus* out of the See of *Jerusalem*, and placed *Cyrill* there, but says nothing of *Maximus's* holding Communion with *Cyrill* afterwards: Yet he saying nothing to the contrary, our Author takes it for granted, that *Maximus* did communicate with *Cyrill*; whereas he mentioning *Maximus* upon the account only of *St. Athanasius*, had no occasion to take any further notice either of him, or of *Cyrill*, than *St. Athanasius* was concerned in it.

I confess *Socrates* agrees with this anonymous Authour of the Life of *St. Athanasius*, in relating that *Maximus* was turned out of his Bishoprick by *Acacius* and *Patrophilus* to make way for *Cyrill*: But *St. Hieron* on the contrary says, that *Maximus* was dead before *St. Cyrill* came into his See;

and *Theodorite*, (p) that *Maximus* being translated to an immortal Life, *Cyrill* succeeded him, who was a vigorous defender of the Catholic Faith; and to put this matter out of all dispute, besides *St. Hieron* and *Theodorite*, we have the express Testimony of the (q) General Council of C. P. that he came in canonically, being ordained by the Bishops of the Province, and had in divers places signalized himself in maintaining the Catholic Faith against the *Arians*.

But there being one *Cyrill* an *Arian*, who, soon after *Maximus*, was made Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and was the next Bishop but one to *St. Cyrill*, the great Uncertainty and Confusion that there is in the Catalogue of the Bishops of this See at that time, as may be seen by comparing the different accounts of their Names in *St. Hieron*, *Epiphanius*, and *Nicephorus*; might easily occasion the Aspersions, which have been cast upon this Father by some Writers, who supposed *St. Cyrill* the *Arian* was that *Cyrill*, who was next in Succession to *Maximus*. But it is abundantly \* sufficient in his Vindication, that a general Council by their united Suffrages have attested both to his being Orthodox, and to the Canonicalness of his Consecration. But I must not omit here to take notice, that tho *Socrates* and the Author of the Life of *St. Athanasius* do both say, that *Cyrill* was made Bishop of *Jeru-*

(p) Τότε δὲ εἰς τὸ ἀγίον μεταβίβασιν, κύριος τῆς ἐπισκοπικῆς καθέδρου, ἢ ἐπισκοπικῶν δογματικῶν συνόδων ἱεραρχῶν. Theod. lib. 2. c. 2.

(q) Τῆς δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀποβίβασιν τῆς ἐκκλησιᾶς τῆς ἐν ἱεροσολύμοις, τὸν αἰσιματώτατον καὶ διοικητικῶν κυριώτατον ἐπίσκοπον ἢ γυναιξιώδη, κατονικῶς τε καὶ ἢ τῆς ἐπισκοπικῆς χειροτονίας τε παλαι, καὶ πάλιν πρὸς τοῦ Ἀθανάσιου ἐκ διαφόρων τόποις ἀδελφώσας. Synod. Ep. Conc. C. P. apud Theod. lib. 5. c. 9.

D

See 2

Vit.  
Athanas.  
p. 48.

Socr. l. 2.  
c. 38.

Hieron. in  
Chron.

*ſalem* by Uſurpation, during the Life of *Maximus*; yet they mention this as done under *Conſtansius*, and it is a Miſtake peculiar to our Author to place it under the Reign of *Conſtantine* the Great, in contradiction to all Hiſtory.

Page 9. The Author now returns again to *Conſtantinople*, and ſays that when *Eutychius* was depoſed from that See, and *John* preferred to it, in the Reign of *Juſtinian*, *Eutychius* continued to communicate with *John*: Which he could bring no Proof of, but there is undeniable Proof of the contrary. For *Eufſathius*, who was an Eye Witneſs to all this buſineſs, and a conſtant Attendant upon *Eutychius* ( r ), has left it written in his Life, that *Eutychius* pronounced Excommunication againſt the Synod, which was called to depoſe him, till they ſhould repent of it, and reſtore him.

Page 9. All that he ſays concerning *Anthimus*, *Sergius*, and others, whole Ordinations, tho they were Hereticks, were allowed of as valid, needs no Answer, enough having been already ſaid on that Point, in the Caſe of *Meletius*.

Page 10. *Callinicus*, he acquaints us, after he was depoſed by *Juſtinian Rhinotmetus*, did not depart from the Communion of *Cyrus*, who was appointed his Succeſſor. He might as well have ſaid, that *Callinicus* ſaw and converſed with *Cyrus*, after the loſs of his Eyes, when he was as far from him as *Rome* is from *Conſtantinople*: For this had been more agreeable to the way of writing Legends, and has altogether as much foundation in Hiſtory as that. Niceph. For the Hiſtorians only ſay, that the Emperor cauſed his Eyes to be put out, and then baniſhed him to *Rome*, but

Cedren.  
p. 446.  
Theophan.  
p. 313.  
Niceph.  
Conſtanti-  
nop. p. 28.

what became of him there, or with whom he communicated, they do not inform us.

The next Inſtance which he dwells longer upon, than any other in his whole Treatiſe, is nothing at all to his purpoſe. For what if *Theodorus Studites* were in fault for ſeparating from the Patriarchs *Taraſius* and *Nicephorus*, becauſe they had admitted *Joſeph* the Steward of the Church to Communion, who had officiated in an unlawful Marriage? How does this prove, that although a Biſhop was unjuſtly deprived, neither he nor the Church ever made a Separation, if the Succeſſor was not an Heretick? Were *Taraſius* and *Nicephorus* Intruders? Or did *Theodorus* ſeparate upon that account? No ſuch thing is pretended; but *Joſeph* had been guilty of a ſcandalous and wicked Action, and yet was ſuffered to continue in Communion, and hereupon *Theodorus* withdraws himſelf from the Church, for which he is blamed, and very juſtly: But this only ſhews, that private Chriſtians ought not to forſake the Church, tho the Diſcipline of it ſhould not be ſo duly adminiſtered as they could wiſh, but muſt take care of their own Duty, tho the Church Governours ſhould be negligent of theirs.

After ſo much ſaid in ſo ſhort a Page 17. Book beſide the Subject, he at laſt comes again to the Point, but falls upon ſuch an Example as is alone enough to diſparage his whole Performance, with any one almoſt, that has ever heard of the Names of *Ignatius* and *Photius*. For what can be more notorious than that *Ignatius* did not Communicate with *Photius*, after he was diſplaced, and *Photius* got into the See? can we imagin he Communicated with one, by whom he ſtood himſelf Excommunicated? with one, who was Excommunicated by his beſt Friend and Advocate Pope *Nicholas*? and who in return had Excommunicated the ſaid Pope?

( r ) *Subjecit omnes canonicis pœnis, donec reſpiſcerent.* Vit. Eutychii c. 3. Auctore Euthathio Presbytero, Domestico familiari.

Pope ? (s) For *Photius* had not been Consecrated forty days before he openly Deposed and Anathematized *Ignatius*, as we have it related in an account, that *Ignatius* sent to Pope *Nicholas* to acquaint him how *Photius* had dealt with him. *Ignatius* was soon after sent into Banishment, where he was kept under so close Confinement, that he was not suffered to perform any part of his Function, and as he was not allowed to stir out, so no body was permitted to come to him. And if there be any thing of certainty in all the History of those affairs, nothing can be more certain, than that *Ignatius* and *Photius* did not hold Communion with each other, for nothing occurs more frequently than the *Anathema's*, which they pronounced one against the other.

But all the Reason our Author seems to have in this and some other Instances, to conclude that the Deposed Patriarch did not refuse Communion with the Intruder, is because both their names were read in the Diptychs: whereas this one instance of *Ignatius* and *Photius* is enough to convince us that this is no good Argument: for it is certain that these two Bishops did not hold Communion with one another; & yet after these differences were composed, which had been occasioned in the Church by setting up *Photius*, both their names were Recorded in the Diptychs; and probably neither Party being to be wrought upon to recede from their Pretensions in behalf of the Patriarch, whose Right they had maintained, this was found to be the only Expedient, to do the same honour, to both of them, which might without difficulty be agreed to, since the Synod, which restored *Photius* after the death of *Ignatius*, had cancelled all the Acts, against *Photius*, of that

Council which Deposed him, and restored *Ignatius*: and this Council which restored *Photius*, is by the Greeks reckoned the eighth General Council.

Concerning the Deposing of *Photius* P. 13. 19 a second time, and the Deposing of *Nicholas*, *Zonaras*, whom our Author quotes, says nothing, from which it may be collected that *Photius* continued Communion with *Stephen*, and *Nicholas* with *Euthymius*, who were put into their rooms. But because *Zonaras* says nothing to the contrary, he concludes, that they did hold Communion with them, which is a very fallacious way of arguing, to make Inferences from a Negative, without any other Reason or Circumstance; especially in so short an account as *Zonaras* gives of these things, who only says, in as few words, as he can well express himself in, that the Emperour picking a quarrel with the Patriarch sent him into a Monastery, and appointed his Brother *Stephen* to be Patriarch; and that *Nicholas* was likewise put into a Monastery; and *Euthymius* constituted Patriarch in his stead. And the same Author in *S. Chrysostom's* Case takes no notice of that separation, which was occasioned by his Banishment, for thirty five years together in the Church, which the more ancient Historians enlarge so much upon, and set forth in so many particulars. And to be convinced that nothing ought to be concluded from the silence, especially of these latter Historians and Annalists, we need only compare what these write, with the account which *Theodorite*, and *Socrates*, and *Sozomen* give of the same Actions, and when it is notorious, that they commonly omit things as material as those they take notice of, nothing more need be said to shew, how little regard is to be had to their omission of things; it is well if we may depend upon what they relate, but to say such a thing never was, because they do not relate it, is such a way of arguing as

(s) Καὶ ὅτι παρὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ  
τὸν ἱερομόναχον πατριάρχου, καὶ τὸν  
ἐπισκόπου, καὶ ἀναδηματόν μὴ πατρῶν.  
Conc. Constantinopol. 4. Col. 1268.



only betrays the weakness of the Cause, and shews how great want there is of better Arguments.

Page 20. And as for the Ordinations of *Eurhymius*, which he says, were not rejected after *Nicholas* was restored again, I have shewn how insignificant an Argument that is, when even after Hereticks were received into the Church upon their Conversion, their Orders were not disallowed.

Id. But his account of *Cosmas Atticus* is the boldest stroke we have had yet, for, when *Nicetas Choniates*, whose Authority he alledges, says in express terms, (1) that he Excommunicated some of the Courtiers, and the Synod too, which Deposed him, this Author has the confidence to quote *Nicetas* to vouch for him, that *Cosmas Atticus* never separated from the Communion of his Deposers. But we have had experience enough of our Author by this time, not to wonder much now at whatever he is pleased to say.

Page 21. Of the Deposing the Patriarchs *Basilus*, *Camaterus*, and *Nicetas*, we have only a bare Narrative in *Nicetas Choniates*, but upon the Promotion of *Desibertus* in the room of *Leontius*, he expressly says, that the chief Bishops, looking upon his Translation from *Jerusalem* to *Constantinople* to be contrary to the Canons, (u) held separate Assemblies.

Our Author has observed that in the space of nine years the Emperour *Isaacus Angelus* made five Patriarchs successively, who were all alive together; but he might have spared his Admiration, that they did not separate from one anothers Communion:

(1) Ἀπορίξιν δὲ καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ τὴν Βασιλέα ἵνα, καὶ τὸτε συνελθόντες εἰς ἑκαστὸν ἐκείνων συνέδριον. *Nicetas Choniates* de Imperat. Manuel. lib. 2. p. 54.

(u) Παρεστῶσαντος τοῦτον, id. de Isaac. lib. 2. p. p. 260.

for if this had been the approved and constant Practice of the Church as he pretends, what great matter of Admiration could it be, that five Patriarchs should do as all their Predecessors had done in the like Case? But the only wonder is, how this Author comes to know, that they did not separate, when the Historian, whom he quotes, says no such thing.

It is plain indeed, that if the Emperour had but any pretence (and it was hard if he could find none) the Greek Church in these Ages was so low, and the Clergy of so base and abject Spirits, that they were prepared to comply with any thing: and if they expressed their Repentments it was in such a manner, as could become the Zeal only of these degenerate times. Thus when *Eurhymius* was Deposed, to make way for the Restauration of *Nicholas* to his See again, the Clergy, who were of *Nicholas's* Party, fell upon *Eurhymius* like mad Men, and beat him with their Fists, and plucked him by the Beard, and flung him down, calling him Usurper, and Adulterer: and if it should be granted that Men who could shew such barbarous usage, should notwithstanding keep in Communion with the Usurper, whom they could think to deserve such usage from them; I suppose their example will be thought of no better Authority in the one than in the other.

But upon the whole matter, after a full examination of all the Instances, which this Author has brought to maintain his Assertion; I must conclude in contradiction to it, that very few, if any, Examples can be produced of Bishops, who were unjustly Deposed, that did hold Communion with the Intruders; and that therefore upon the account of any thing, which is offered in this Treatise, a Separation is not Unreasonable.



## R E M A R K S

UPON THE

*Greek and Latin Edition.*

**S**INCE my writing this, I have met with the Greek and Latin Edition of this Author, and besides Mr. Hody's Preface, there are some few things in the Book it self further to be observed.

In the English Preface to this Treatise we are told, that *there is no Name prefixed before it; nor any Characters in it that may lead us to a probable Conjecture about the Author.* But Mr. Hody, in his Preface to the Greek and Latin Edition, thinks he has discovered the Author to be *Nicephorus Callistus*; that which he grounds his Conjecture upon is, that this Discourse is in the same Volume with several other Manuscripts, which have the Name of *Nicephorus Callistus* to them, but he does not acquaint us that this is written in the same hand with the rest, nor that it has the least

Connexion or Affinity with them; nor that all the other Tracts in that Volume have his Name before them; and when the other Treatises have his Name prefixed, and this has it not, it is most probable that this is not his; for if it were, it would bear his Name as well as the rest: Indeed, if some of the most remarkable Tracts only had his Name to them, and others, which were known to be his, were among them without his Name, it would not be unlikely that this might be his too; but when the rest have his Name, and this has none, what can be more reasonably concluded from it, than that there was as much cause why his Name should be omitted in this, as why it was prefixed before the rest? Mr. Hody himself observes, that there is no exact agreement in the Catalogue of the Patriarchs of C. P. by *Nicephorus*,

*phorus*, and the account of them in this Author. But there is a much greater and more obvious Difference between them than that, for *Nicephorus Callistus* writes in an easy flowing stile, and with great Elegancy, considering the Age in which he wrote; but our Author is heavy and unpleasant, and scarce able to express that little he has to say; and the best thing that can be said of his stile is, that it is as good as the Subject deserves, and it is great pity that such Stuff should be put into any better Language. But there is another Difference between these two Authors yet more remarkable; for *Nicephorus*, giving an account of (a) *St. Chrysostom's* parting Words to his Friends, makes their holding Communion with the succeeding Bishop to depend wholly upon his Permission; he says, that *St. Chrysostom* did an extraordinary thing, which was without example, and had something more than Humane in it,

(a) 'Ο δὲ μέγας ἐκκλησιᾶς μὴ ἔχον  
πρεσβυτέρων, ἢ ἡγετῶν ἀνδρῶν, οὐδὲ  
τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὁσμῶντων, ἡρώμα  
ἐπίσκοπος κοινωσάτω μετ' ἡμῶν τοῖς ἱ-  
εροῖς ἐκκλησιαῖς ἐπιτηδεύοντες ἕως ἡμέ-  
ρας, τῇ ἐμῇ καὶ δωρεῇ ἀπογυ-  
σθῶν ἐκ ἐπιτηδεύου, ἢ δὲ γὰρ ἑμαυτῶν  
καὶ δωρεῆς αἰετὸν σπουδάζει, *Niceph.*  
*lib. 13. cap. 20.*

when he gave leave to his Friends to live in communion with Bishops, by whom he had been so ill used: Whereas our Author makes it not to depend upon any Permission of the rightful Bishop, but to be the constant practice of the Church, and the indispensable Duty of all Christians to submit to every Intruder, if he be no Heretick.

But if there were as much reason to believe that *Nicephorus Callistus* was the Author of this Treatise, as there is to think that he was not; yet his Name would give no great Credit to it, but a Suspicion rather, that it is not to be credited: For, excepting *Malela*, lately published by *Mr. Hody*, there is scarce any Author more fabulous than *Nicephorus*. But this Manuscript outgoes even *Malela*, and may have the Reputation of being the worst Greek Author extant, 'till *Mr. Hody* is pleased to publish some other.

Both the Latin and the English Preface suppose this Tract to have been a Sermon or Homily, or at least, as it is added in the Latin, to have been a Lecture in the Schools of some Professor of History, because in two places he bespeaks his Auditor, and not his Reader. I have no mind to maintain a Controversie about a thing

thing of no moment, but this Reason does not satisfy me; for I find that (b) *Epiphanius* addresses himself to his Auditors in his Book against Heresies, tho no Man can therefore imagin, that that Book consists of as many Homilies, as he treats of Heresies; and he writes in the same manner in his Book of *Measures and Weights*, tho it appears, that that Book was neither an Homily, nor a Lecture. I rather believe, that Copies of Books being dear and scarce, before the Invention of Printing, it was customary to recite other Discourses as well as Homilies or Lectures, and that therefore such Expressions might either be used at first by the Author, or be afterwards inserted by him that recited it. Besides, the stile of this Treatise does not seem at all like to that of an Homily; for their Homilies, after the decay of Learning, were full of Hyperboles, Antitheses, Tautologies, and frequent Repetitions of the same Words, and all the Affectations of a

false Eloquence; but our Author uses few Words, without any shew of Eloquence, or pretence to it; for to do him right, he seems to have understood his own Talent better, than to pretend to any thing in that way.

Having said thus much of the Author, Mr. *Hody* comes now to give an account of his Reasons for the Publication, and here he informs his Reader in very tragical Terms, that the Church of *England* being all in Flames, he, for our comfort, has found out this new Engine to quench the Fire. I desire to be as apprehensive of the Mischiefs of Schism as any Man, and therefore must beseech all Christians seriously to consider, whether this Treatise be not more likely to promote Schisms in the Church, than to prevent or remove them.

His next business is to set down some Examples from Antiquity, which he puts our present Bishops in mind, it is their duty to follow. The first is that of *S. Chrysostom*, but he has said no more of him than we had before in the English Preface, excepting that he has framed a new Speech for him; which makes me begin to suspect that perhaps *Palladius* took the same liberty,

---

( b ) "Οπως γινώσκῃς, ὃ φιλόκαλὸν ἀκροατὰ, Epiph. Her. 64. n. 5. ἀπ' ἐγγὺς ἐν ἀναλέξασιν τῶν ἱερῶν, ib. δὴσεται οὗτο, ὃ ἀκροατὰ, Epiph. de Mensur. Ponderib. n. 2. Καὶ πάντα μὴδ' οὐδ' ἅλ' πλείονων ἀμνησίων σοι γυγνέσθαι, ib. n. 17.



liberty, that Mr. *Hody* has done; for Declamations are as usual and altogether as proper in a Dialogue as in a Preface.

( c ) *lib. de Gestis cum emendato.*  
His next Instance is of St. *Augustin* and the rest of the African Bishops in the Conference at *Carthage* ( c ). The account S. *Augustin* gives us is this, that before they held this Conference with the Donatists, the Catholick Bishops made a Proposal, that if the Donatists could convince them, that they were in the wrong, they would be contented to be received by the Donatists, not as Bishops, but to Lay-Communion only, as private Christians; but the Donatist Bishops, if they were convicted of Error, should be permitted, upon their Repentance, to preside in the same Sees together with the Catholick Bishops, and the Survivors to be the sole Bishops of the Sees; or if it would not be approved of, that there should be two Bishops at once of the same Church; that both the Catholick and Donatist Bishops should resign, and that new Bishops should be appointed in all such Churches, where the Donatists had their Bishops, as well as the Catholicks. And St. *Augustin* says, that of almost Three Hundred Bishops, there were but Two

who made any scruple or demur upon it, all besides were earnest and zealous for this Expedient; and these Two were soon brought over to be of the same mind with the rest. This is the full of what St. *Augustin* relates, and I need not tell the Reader, tho I must tell Mr. *Hody*, that it is nothing to the present Subject: But it is observable that the Schismatical Bishops were so refractory in the Conference at *Carthage*, that they gave little encouragement for the Rightful Bishops to make any such Proposals to Intruders afterwards.

St. *Gregory Nazianzen's* Case has been spoken to already: And as for the Advice which St. *Dionysius* of *Alexandria* gave to *Novatian*, when he pretended that he was unwillingly made Bishop, that this would be best seen by his desisting from his Usurpation; it is admirable Advice, and I hope, all will take notice of it, who are concerned.

Another Citation he produces from the first Epistle of St. *Clement* to the *Corinthians*, to shew, that that Father exhorted the Presbyters, who were ordained by the Apostles themselves, rather to recede from their Right, when they were turbed out by a Faction, than to occasion any Division



Division in the Church. But it seems plain to me, that *St. Clement* gives this Admonition, not to the Rightful Presbyters, but to those who had stirred up and fomented the Differences: For not long before he exhorts ( c ) all who had been the principal Authors and Abettors of Sedition and Dissention, to regard the common Good more than their own private Interest; for those who lived in Charity, would rather condemn themselves, than destroy the Order and Discipline of the Church; and it was better for Men to confess their Sins, than to harden their Hearts, as *Corab* and his Associates did, who raised a Sedition against *Moses*; and as *Pharaoh* and the *Egyptians* had likewise done: Then he exhorts them to the Confession of their Sins from several Passages out of the Psalms, and afterwards sets before them the Example of *Moses*, who in a wonderful Extasie of Zeal and Charity for the People, who had sacrificed to the molten Calf, desired rather to be himself blotted out of God's Book, than that they should perish;

and then says, that if there were any among them of a generous and charitable and truly Christian Spirit, he would depart; and go whither they pleased, if so be, the People would live quietly and peaceably under the Presbyters constituted over them. And besides the Example of *Moses*, he proceeds to take notice, that among the Gentiles themselves, Kings and other Magistrates had often exposed their own Persons to danger and ruin for the Preservation of their People, and others had left their Countrey rather than they would be the occasion of any disturbance in it; nay, that many Christians had to his own knowledg delivered themselves up into Captivity to redeem others, and many had sold themselves for Slaves to feed others with the Price of their own Servitude: And among the Jews, *Judith* and *Esther* refused no Dangers for the Deliverance of their Nation. ( d ) Let us then, says he, pray for those who are in fault, ( \* ) that

E. 54.

E. 55.

c. 52.

c. 53.

( c ) Καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ ὁμιλοῦμεν ἀλλήλους τῆς σωτῆρος καὶ διχοστασίας ἐκφυγεῖν, ἀφαιρῶν τὸ κοινὸν τῷ ἐλπίδος σκοπῷ, c. 51.

( d ) Καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐσφαλμένων αὐτῶν ὅτι ἐν πνεύματι καταρχήτων, &c. c. 56.

( \* ) So it must be translated, if we read *καταρχήτων*, as it is in the Text; and not *ἐσφαλμένων*, as it is, by conjecture only, put in the Margin.

E

Meekness

*Modesty and Humility may be given them, that they may yield, not to us, but to the Will of God. And because this might seem a hard saying to many, and too difficult to be put in practice, he shews them that they ought patiently to receive Admonition, and to submit to that Correction and Chastisement, which God should be pleased to inflict either by his own Hand upon them, or by the Discipline of the Church: You therefore that have laid the Foundations of Sedition, submit yourselves to the Presbytery, in order to your Repentance, and be humble; and learn to be obedient, laying aside the proud and boasting Arrogance of your Tongue; for it is better to be one of the little ones, who are approved of in the Flock of Christ, than by aspiring too high, to fall short of*

\* 16 *ἔξω*

*ἡ ἀρχὴ* of the Fold: The Force of

*ἀδ. marg.*

St. Clement's Discourse seems to be this, that if *Moses* was so indulgent and affectionate towards the People who had sinned so heinously against God; this ought to be a powerful Motive to those, who had been themselves criminal, to resign up all particular Interests for the Peace of the Church; and if it had been so usual for the most innocent and worthy Persons

to sacrifice their own Safety and Honours to the publick, it might much rather be expected from such as had themselves given the first occasion to the Divisions in the Church. His Design is the same that *Dionysius* afterwards had in his Letter to *Novatian*, and that he might persuade them the more effectually to desist from their Pretensions, he tells them that this was no more than the most worthy and heroick Persons had done before them, not upbraiding them too severely with their past Miscarriages, and pressing it upon them as a Duty, which in justice they were bound to, and which was the least Satisfaction they could make to the Church, to forbear those Practices which had caused so much Disturbance, but proceeding in a more gentle Method; and yet in the meantime not failing to let them know, that he required them not to resign any Right, but to desist from an unjust Claim, which was the least that could be expected of them; but if it should seem grievous to Men who had been so long puffed up with vain Expectations, and high Conceits of themselves, to be thus humbled at last, he acquaints them, that they must consider, that the Chastisements of God must

be

be born with patience in much severer instances than this affliction, which they had brought upon themselves, and that however irksome it might now seem, it would bring Peace and Joy to them in the end.

But if we understand St. Clement, as Mr. Hody does, to exhort those, who were the lawful Presbyters to resign their Right, rather than be the occasion, through the Wickedness and Injustice of others towards them, of Trouble and Disorder to the Church, we must necessarily suppose some extraordinary Circumstances, which made St. Clement advise them to this Condescension in their particular Case. For it is not to be imagined that he should lay it down as a general Rule in all Cases, that a Bishop or Presbyter, whenever he is molested or dispossessed, must give way to the Intruder for Peace sake; but we must of necessity understand this Precept and Admonition in some such qualified sense, as we do those Commands of our Saviour himself, *Whoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.* For to oblige all honest Men to

suffer themselves to be abused, and to give up their Rights of any kind for the sake of Peace and Quietness, would be so far from being a means to procure Peace, that it would be the readiest and most effectual way to all manner of Confusion in the World. So that the utmost that this Quotation from St. Clement can amount to, is only thus much, that for some special Reasons, and in some extraordinary Cases, it would be an act of great Charity and worthy of a Christian, for a Bishop to condescend so far, as to recede from his own Right; which affords nothing in proof of that Doctrine, that this Greek Author is published to advance, *That although a Bishop was unjustly deprived, neither he nor the Church ever made a Separation; if the Successor was not an Heretick.*

The Quotations from St. Irenaeus, and from the Apostles Constitutions are excellent Cautions and Persuasions against Schisms in general, but do not in the least concern the Cause before us. And I heartily pray, that either their Authority or any other may have the effect, which it bight, upon those, who are most concerned seriously to take notice of them, towards the pre-



venting a Schism, which seems to threaten the Destruction of the best Church in the World; to the Ruin whereof nothing can more contribute, than to teach that a Bishop, when once deposed, is never so (e) unjustly, ceases to be any longer Bishop of his See: Which are Words now put into St. Chrysostom's Mouth; but how much against all reason and probability has been already shewn.

P. 1. In the Book it self, where it is said, that Meletius was translated from Sebastia to Antioch, Eustathius being yet in Banishment; in the English Edition this Eustathius is supposed to be Eustathius late Bishop of Sebastia: But in the Greek and Latin Edition, Eustathius late Bishop of Antioch; and a Note is subjoyn'd to inform us, that both Sozocrates and Sozomen say, that Eustathius Bishop of Antioch lived till the Reign of Valens, and that the Arguments which Baronius and Valesius bring to the contrary, are not of weight enough to be set against the Authority of these two Historians.

( e. ) Ego actus ab episcopatu, quantumvis per injuriam summam, cello esse vester Episcopus, &c. Mr. Hody's Preface.

Baronius argues, that Eustathius of Antioch never lived to be recalled from Banishment by Jovian, but died in exile under Constantius: For if he had been recalled; it cannot be supposed, that no mention should be made of him in the Synod of Antioch, which was held at that time by the Orthodox; and besides neither Meletius nor Paulinus would have been suffered by the People of Antioch to be consecrated, and reside there as their Bishop, if he had been still living, without their dividing into Parties about it; since a great part of the Orthodox from their great Zeal and Affection for him were denominated Eustathians. And if Eustathius had survived his Banishment, there is no question, but both Meletius and Paulinus would have resigned the See to him at his return. For Meletius was put into that See at the earnest desire of the orthodox Bishops after the Banishment of Eustathius, and he who was so condescending to Paulinus, would have yielded much more to Eustathius himself: For all the pretence that Paulinus could have, was to be Bishop over a Party of Men, who for the great Veneration they had for Eustathius, were called Eustathians;

thians; and who would not live in communion with *Meletius*; because he had been ordained by *Arians*: And it is absurd to think that *Paulinus*, the chief of the *Eustathian* Party, would retain his Bishoprick, if *Eustathius* himself had been yet living; unless perhaps we say, that *Eustathius* had wholly relinquished his See to him, and that he lived concealed at *Constantinople*, or in some other place from the time of his first Banishment (as *Socrates* and *Sozomen* say, he did, in the Reign of *Valens*) till he was a second time banished. But to put this out of all Controvertie, *Theodorite* expressly (f) says, that *Eustathius* was dead before *Meletius* succeeded him in the See of *Antioch*, and his Authority alone, without any concurring Evidence, is sufficient to oppose to that of *Socrates* and *Sozomen*: But if it were not, besides what has been already said, their Account, as *Valesius* observes, disagrees from what *St. Hierom* \* and *Theodorus Lectior*, and *Theophanes* relate concerning this *Eustathius*: So that we

must conclude, that *Eustathius* of *Sebastia* is meant by the Greek Author, or else that this is another of his Mistakes.

In the Greek it is said, *p. 5.*  
that *Arsacius* because of the Jealousie of his Brother *Nectarius* towards him, had formerly sworn, that he would never accept of the See of *Constantinople*. But in the English this is omitted in the Text, and set down only in the Margin, with this Note; that *p. 2.*  
*the Manuscript in this place is written erroneously. Mr. Hody* in the Greek and Latin Edition takes no notice, that this is an Error, being more tender now, it seems, of the Credit of his Author, and perhaps of *Palladius* too, from whom he had it. *Pallad. p. 91.*

I wish Mr. Hody had been as careful of his Author's Reputation, and of his own too in all other Respects as in this. And after such Protections of sincere and charitable Intentions in publishing this Manuscript, it could hardly be imagined that he had omitted any thing, which belonged to this wonderful Treatise, which he so much values and so highly magnifies: But it is an unlucky thing to be engaged in a Cause, which no Author ever yet had enough of the Greek in him:

\* *Vales. ad*  
*Socr. l. 4.*  
*c. 15.*

(f) Περὶ τοῦ τῆς Μελετίου καὶ  
ἐπιστολῆς, ἐκ τῆς αὐτοῦ  
Theod. lib. 3. cap. 4.

to maintain; and therefore, as I am well assured, *he has left out a Collection of Canons at the end of the Manuscript written in the same hand, and by the same Author, which shews that the Author is to be understood of synodical Deprivations:* For, since there were no synodical Proceedings in the present Deprivations, that part of the Manuscript must be suppressed, lest it should make all the rest impertinent to the Controversie arising from the present state of our Church, tho it were all as true, as I have shewn it to be false. The Canons annexed are a sufficient Answer to the Book, as far as we are concerned in it, and therefore it was great Prudence to conceal them. This looks as if *Malela* were not only fabulous, but infectious too, and will be apt to make Men suspect, that *Malela* himself is worse in the Print than in the Manuscript.

And this is all that I shall say, and I think a great deal

more than was necessary to be said, of a Book, which instead of being sent into the World with so much Ostentation and Triumph, would have been in danger of a publick Censure at any other time but this, since the Reformation; excepting only that Interval, when we had all our Bishops deposed at once. And to endeavour to maintain a Cause by such Arguments and such Authorities, as are both notoriously false, and of so pernicious consequence, that they would have been suffered at no other time, and any other Cause would have been ashamed of them; and then to be forced too upon such Arts, as may be very necessary in an ill Cause, but would never surely be used in a good one, is no less than a Confession of the badness of a Cause; and is so far from being a Defence, that it is an evident sign, that it cannot be defended.



## The C A N O N S in the Baroccian Manuscripts omitted by Mr. Hody.

Τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων Κανὼν λα'.

The XXXI. Canon of the Holy Apostles, by a Mistake for the XXXII.

Can. Ap. 32.

**I**F any Presbyter, contemning his own Bishop, shall hold a separate Meeting, and erect an opposite Altar, having nothing wherewith to charge the Bishop in Matters of † Piety and Justice, let him be deposed, as an ambitious

Affector of Government; for he is an Usurper. In like manner, as many of the Clergy that shall joyn with him, shall be deposed, and the Laicks excommunicated: But all this ought to be done after the first, the second, and third Admonition of the Bishop.

† or Faith.

Τῆς ἐν Γάγγραι Σиноδῶς Κανὼν ε'.

The VI. Canon of the Synod of Gangra.

Synod. Gangr.  
Can. 6.

If any Man hold a private Meeting out of the Church, and despising the Church, shall presume to perform the Offices of the Church †, the of-

ficiating Presbyter not being thereunto licensed by the Bishop, let him be Anathema.

† Note that in the Original it is Επισκοπῆς, instead of Προσβυτέρου as the printed Canons have it.

Τῆς ἐν Ἀντιοχείας Σиноδῶς Κανὼν ε'.

The V. Canon of the Synod of Antioch.

Syn. Antioch.  
Can. 5.

If any Presbyter or Deacon, despising his own Bishop hath withdrawn himself from the Church, and set up an Altar in a private Meeting, and shall disobey the Admonitions of the Bishop, and will not be persuaded by him, nor submit to him, exhorting him again and again, he is abso-

lutely to be deposed; and ought no longer to be treated as a curable Person, neither as one who can retain his Honour; and if he shall persevere to make Tumult and Disturbances in the Church, he is to be turned over, as a seditious Person to the secular Power.

Τῆς αὐτῆς Σиноδῶς Κανὼν ιε'.

The XV. Canon of the same Synod.

Eccl. Synodi  
Can. 25.

If any Bishop accus'd of any Crimes be condemned by all the Bishops of the Province, who have all with one accord denounced the same Sentence against him, such a one by no means

ought to be judged again by others; but the concordant Sentence of the Provincial Bishops ought to remain firm.

Τῆς ἐν Καρχηδόνι Κανὼν ι'.

The X. Canon of the Synod of Carthage.

Syn. Carth.  
Can. 10.

If any Presbyter being puffed up against his own Bishop, shall make a

Schism, let him be Anathema.

Τῆς

en  
ent  
re-  
a for

Τὸς α ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς Συναδικαστὴς καὶ 2<sup>ο</sup>.

*The XIII. Can. of the Syn. of Constantinople, called the 1<sup>st</sup>. and 2<sup>d</sup>. Synod.*

The Devil having sown the Seeds of Heretical Tares in the Church of Christ, and seeing them cut up by the roots by the Sword of the Spirit, hath betaken himself to a new way and method, viz. to divide the Church by the madness of Schismatics: But the holy Synod being also willing to obviate this Stratagem of his, hath decreed as followeth; If any Presbyter or Deacon, under the pretence of accusing his own Bishop of any Crimes, shall presume to withdraw from his Communion, and not mention his Name in the holy Prayers of the Liturgy according to the Tradition of the Church, \* before Synodical Judgment and Tryal, such a one shall be

deposed and deprived of all sacerdotal Honour; for he that is in the Order of a Priest, and shall usurp the Power of Judging, belonging to the Metropolitans, and as much as in him lies shall condemn his own Father and Bishop, before Sentence pronounced by them, he is worthy neither of the Honour nor Appellation of a Presbyter, and those who are Followers of such a one, if they are in holy Orders, even any of them shall be degraded from his proper Honour; but if they are Monks, or Laicks, they shall by all means be excommunicated from the Church, until abhorring the Conversation of Schismatics they shall return unto their proper Bishop.

Τὸς αὐτὸς Συναδικαστὴς καὶ 1<sup>ο</sup>.

*The XIV. Canon of the same Synod.*

If any Bishop, pretending an Accusation against his Metropolitan †, before Synodical Judgment, shall withdraw himself from communion with him, and shall not recite his Name according to custom in Divine Service, the holy Synod hath decreed that such a one shall be deposed, if after

private ‡ Admonition he shall depart from his own Metropolitan, and make a Schism: For it behoves every one to know his own proper bounds; and that neither the Presbyter despise his own proper Bishop, nor the Bishop his own Metropolitan.

Τὸς αὐτὸς Συναδικαστὴς καὶ 1<sup>ο</sup>.

*The XV. Canon of the same Synod.*

These Decrees concerning Presbyters, Bishops and Metropolitans, agree also to Patriarchs; So that if any Bishop or Metropolitan shall presume to depart from Communion with his own Patriarch, and shall not mention his Name in the Divine Offices, as is decreed and ordered, but shall make a Separation \* before Synodical Conviction, and final Condemnation of him; the holy Synod hath decreed, that such a one be absolutely deposed from all sacred Orders, if he offend in this kind after private ‡ Admonition. And these things are decreed and enacted concerning those who under pretence of any Accusations revolt from their own Superiors, and make a Schism, \* and break the Unity of the Church. But if any shall

separate themselves from Communion with their Superior for any Heresie condemned by the holy Synods and Fathers, he publicly preaching the same Heresie to the People, and teaching it bare-faced in the Church, such shall not only be free from Canonical Censure for separating themselves from Communion with the Bishop so called \* before Synodical Condemnation, but they shall be thought worthy of the Honour that is due to the Orthodox, because they have not condemned a Bishop, but a false Bishop, and a false Teacher, and have not divided the Unity of the Church by Schism, but have studiously endeavoured to preserve the Church from Schisms and Divisions.

FINIS.

REPRODUCED FROM THE COPY IN THE  
**HENRY E. HUNTINGTON LIBRARY**

---

FOR REFERENCE ONLY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION